

# ANALYTIC MULTI-REGGE THEORY AND THE POMERON IN QCD : II. GAUGE THEORY ANALYSIS\*

ALAN R. WHITE

High Energy Physics Division

Argonne National Laboratory

Argonne, IL 60439

## Abstract

The high-energy Regge behavior of gauge theories is studied via the formalism of Analytic Multi-Regge Theory. Perturbative results for spontaneously-broken theories are first organised into reggeon diagrams. Unbroken gauge theories are studied via a reggeon diagram infra-red analysis of symmetry restoration. Massless fermions play a crucial role and the case of  $QCD$  involves the Super-Critical Pomeron as an essential intermediate stage.

An introductory review of the build up of transverse momentum diagrams and reggeon diagrams from leading log calculations in gauge theories is presented first. It is then shown that the results closely reproduce the general structure for multi-regge amplitudes derived in Part I of the article, allowing the construction of general reggeon diagrams for spontaneously-broken theories. Next it is argued that, with a transverse-momentum cut-off, unbroken gauge theories can be reached through an infra-red limiting process which successively decouples fundamental representation Higgs fields.

The first infra-red limit studied is the restoration of  $SU(2)$  gauge symmetry. The analysis is dominated by the exponentiation of divergences imposed by Reggeon Unitarity and the contribution of massless quarks to reggeon interactions. Massless quarks

---

\*Work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Division of High Energy Physics, Contract W-31-109-ENG-38.

also produce “triangle anomaly” transverse-momentum divergences which *do not exponentiate* but instead are absorbed into a *reggeon condensate* - which can be viewed as a “generalised winding-number condensate”. The result is a reggeon spectrum consistent with confinement and chiral symmetry breaking, but there is *no Pomeron*. The analysis is valid when the gauge coupling does not grow in the infra-red region, that is when a sufficient number of massless quarks is present. An analogy is drawn between the confinement produced by the reggeon condensate and that produced by regularisation of the fermion sea, in the presence of the anomaly, in the two-dimensional Schwinger model.

When the analysis is extended to the case of *QCD* with the gauge symmetry restored to  $SU(2)$ , the Reggeon condensate can be identified with the Pomeron condensate of Super-Critical Pomeron theory. In this case, the condensate *converts an  $SU(2)$  singlet reggeised gluon to a Pomeron Regge pole* - which becomes an  $SU(3)$  singlet when the full gauge symmetry is restored. The condensate disappears as  $SU(3)$  symmetry is recovered and, in general this limit gives the Critical Pomeron at a particular value of the transverse cut-off. If the maximal number of fermions consistent with asymptotic freedom is present no transverse momentum cut-off is required.

For  $SU(N)$  gauge theory it is argued that, when the theory contains many fermions, there are  $N - 2$  Pomeron Regge poles of alternating signature. This spectrum of Pomeron trajectories is in direct correspondence with the topological properties of transverse flux tubes characterised by the center  $Z_N$  of the gauge group. The corresponding Reggeon Field Theory solution of  $s$ -channel unitarity should include a representation of  $Z_N$  in the cutting rules.

Finally the implications of the results for the phenomenological study of the Pomeron as well as the for the construction of *QCD* with a small number of flavors are discussed. Also discussed is the attractive possibility that a flavor-doublet of color sextet quarks could both produce the Critical Pomeron in QCD and also be responsible for electroweak dynamical symmetry breaking.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

This is the second part of what we hope will be a definitive article, presenting as well as we are able, the understanding of the Pomeron in  $QCD$  that our long study of the problem has produced. The first part[1] of the article was relatively straightforward in that it simply described all of the general Analytic Multi-Regge Theory that we believe is necessary both conceptually and technologically to attack the problem. This second part deals directly with the analysis of  $QCD$  and gauge theories in general and involves a complex mixture of straightforward perturbative Regge limit calculations with elaborate dynamical concepts and all-orders manipulations.

The problem of the Pomeron in  $QCD$  necessarily couples the infra-red and ultra-violet behavior of the theory in a “vacuum” sector and so involves, either directly or indirectly, almost all dynamical properties of the theory. As a consequence there are many points of principle and subtleties of interpretation which we find it necessary to discuss at some length. While this may make our presentation seem excessively complicated (and even convoluted), we feel that the final outcome is both simple and attractive. Indeed we hope that by the end of the article the reader will agree that we are at a very exciting stage. While there remains an enormous amount of work to do to completely construct the dynamical picture we formulate we do believe that, at least in principle, we have solved the fundamental problem of how to extract the physical Pomeron from the full dynamical complexity of  $QCD$ .

If we claim that we have a solution to a problem involving the infra-red behavior of  $QCD$ , then clearly we must have something to say about confinement. Indeed we find that the nature of the Pomeron is intimately tied to the question of the true physical states of the theory. The core of our dynamical picture is that, *in the Regge limit and with a sufficient number of massless quarks*, confinement can be understood via an analysis of transverse momentum infra-red divergences. Quarks play a crucial role in our analysis and, in effect, confinement emerges as an outcome of the regularisation of the massless quark sea, in a manner that closely parallels the well-known solution of the two-dimensional massless Schwinger model[2].

The Regge limit is essentially determined by the on mass-shell regions of Feynman diagrams and, at the most elementary level, the technology we exploit can be viewed as simply enforcing unitarity and analyticity on the organisation and (infinite) summation

of perturbative Regge region contributions to general multiparticle scattering amplitudes. Although it would be an indirect way to proceed, the asymptotic states of  $QED$  (to the extent they are defined) can actually be found by summing infra-red divergences in the Regge limit. In this context, our arguments would confirm the result[3] that in  $QED$ , the recently discovered[4] “new anomaly” due to the mass-shell region of a massless electron loop decouples from the true asymptotic states. However, as is well-known, the photon does not reggeize in  $QED$  and so all the infra-red divergences associated with reggeization are absent in this case. Of course,  $QCD$  has to be more complicated than  $QED$  if the true asymptotic states are to emerge as bound states as expected. Indeed in our formalism it is the combination of the divergences of reggeization with the infra-red “anomalies” of massless quarks which is the key to the emergence of a confinement spectrum. (In this context an anomaly is the violation of the consequences of a Ward identity that follow from the assumption of no infra-red singularities.)

Our analysis suggests that the role of infra-red quark-loop anomalies is as follows. First we note that the full array of multi-regge limits and multiple discontinuities that we consider leads to a complex structure of “off-shell” reggeon amplitudes. In particular there exist “unphysical” reggeon amplitudes which *are not related to on-shell particle amplitudes* but contribute vitally to the process of summation of divergences. It is these amplitudes which contain “anomalous” infra-red contributions from massless quark loops and it is the resulting divergences which ultimately are responsible for confinement. It seems to be a general property that the anomalies involved do not destroy the reggeization properties of the theory (that are also a manifestation of gauge invariance) just because they occur only in unphysical amplitudes.

Our general understanding will enable us to arrive at a number of results and conclusions. For example, we shall see that  $QCD$  (that is  $SU(3)$  gauge theory) is very special and uniquely able to produce the strong-interaction high-energy asymptotic behavior seen in experiments. The associated Critical Pomeron[5] behavior occurs at a value of the transverse momentum cut-off which increases with the number of flavors and occurs without such a cut-off when the theory is “saturated” with quarks. We shall emphasise that the Critical Pomeron is particularly important in the context of  $QCD$  because of its ability to reconcile, at asymptotic energies, short distance Parton Model properties with the confinement and chiral symmetry breaking vacuum properties that are essential for the physical applicability of the theory. The Super-Critical Pomeron[1] emerges as describing a form of gauge sym-

metry breaking and plays a vital role in relating quark and gluon Regge behavior to that of the Pomeron and hadrons. The symmetry breaking is associated with a “reggeon condensate” which, in a very particular sense, can be thought of as a generalised “winding number condensate” [2].

The “Pomeranchon” (which soon evolved into the Pomeron) was born[6] as a simple Regge pole more than thirty years ago. The original reasons for supposing its existence were entirely phenomenological, apart from the general aesthetic appeal of the newly introduced concept of Regge behavior. Ten years later a fundamental debate on whether such Regge behavior can occur in quantum field theory was underway[7], based on its absence (due to the dominance of large transverse momenta) in leading log *summations* in massive *QED*. The field theory *reggeization* of fermions had been understood[8] by this time, but a bound-state Pomeron remained elusive. Meanwhile the abstract formalism of multi-regge theory[9] based on analyticity and unitarity, and the related Reggeon Field Theory formalism[10], had begun its development and the theoretical virtues of a Pomeron Regge pole began to be appreciated. When string theories containing something[11] very close to the desired Pomeron came into vogue, concern about the absence of such behavior in *QED*, or field theory in general, essentially dissipated. As we emphasised in Part I, the culmination of the general formalism is the Critical Pomeron solution[5] of the Reggeon Field Theory referred to above - which still provides the only known (“non-trivial”) solution of all analyticity and unitarity constraints at asymptotic energies.

Since the acceptance of *QCD* as a field theory of the strong interaction the question of whether a Pomeron Regge pole, and more importantly the Critical Pomeron, can occur in field theory has re-emerged as of prime significance. Particularly since essentially the same leading-log calculations and *summations* performed for *QED* were repeated[12, 13] for (spontaneously-broken) non-abelian theories and showed the same phenomenon, in the vacuum channel, of the dominance of large transverse momenta leading (after summation) to non-Regge behavior. (This is essentially the “Lipatov Pomeron”[14] which we shall return to below). Of course, quark confinement is believed to be a major part of the dynamical solution of *QCD* and it could be that the Pomeron describing hadron scattering originates entirely from a confining “string-like” solution of the theory which is completely divorced from perturbation theory. However, if this were the case, we would lose all connection between the vector nature of the gluon and the approximate constancy of hadronic total

cross-sections (and as a consequence any understanding of how or why Critical Pomeron behavior should occur). It would probably also imply much less validity for the parton model, and perturbative calculations in general, than is conventionally assumed.

As we emphasised in Part I, and touched on above, our viewpoint is that the Pomeron and its consistency with analyticity and unitarity provides a true testing-ground for the compatibility of conventional assumptions about the short-distance and long-distance behavior of  $QCD$ . Consequently a complete understanding of the Pomeron is not to be found in either a purely “perturbative” (multi-)gluon exchange picture or in some form of “non-perturbative” flux-tube (string-)picture of confining  $QCD$ . Rather we have to understand how and why it is that the Pomeron achieves a marriage of these two contrasting pictures. The Sub-Critical Pomeron described by conventional Reggeon Field Theory has a very natural association with the non-perturbative flux-tube picture, whereas we argued in Part I that the Super-Critical Pomeron should describe a spontaneously-broken gauge theory - in which perturbation theory (at low transverse momentum) has at least partial validity. This clearly suggests that the Critical Pomeron should be related to some form of transition between the perturbative and non-perturbative pictures. It also suggests that if we wish to start from perturbative calculations and reach the Pomeron of non-perturbative confining  $QCD$  we can anticipate that, as we discussed in Part I, it will be necessary to go through the Super-Critical Phase.

While the general arguments and analysis presented in Part I clearly underly our whole approach in this Part, we do believe that our procedure for studying  $QCD$  can be directly motivated without reference to abstract Pomeron theory. Indeed, with the hope of attracting the interest of young theorists raised entirely on  $QCD$ , we shall try to emphasise the direct motivation as much as possible and minimise the reference to abstract Pomeron theory until the later stages of our analysis. Our starting point is Regge limit *low transverse momentum* perturbation theory calculations. In effect this is unavoidable because perturbation theory is all we have to concretely define  $QCD$  for our purposes. Also, since the Higgs mechanism is the only available *unitary* infra-red cut-off, we inevitably begin with calculations in spontaneously-broken gauge theories. Therefore our starting point does not require any reference to Super-Critical Pomeron theory or to the virtues of the multi-Regge S-Matrix which we discuss below, to justify it. We should emphasise, however, that the summation and limiting procedures involving reggeon diagrams that we employ to reach confining  $QCD$  from our “perturbative” starting point are only directly valid under the very limited circumstances that the gauge coupling does not grow in the infra-red region. That

the results we obtain are then also consistent with a flux-tube picture can be viewed as welcome independent justification for our procedure.

We should also note the current variety of interpretations given by different authors to the words “the Pomeron in  $QCD$ ”. Recently it has become popular to distinguish phenomenologically the “soft” (or “non-perturbative”) Pomeron from the “hard” (or “perturbative”) Pomeron. While it is certainly not clear that any absolute distinction can be made, either experimentally or theoretically, we can distinguish correspondingly distinct theoretical starting points. The “hard Pomeron” appears in the study[14, 15, 16] of problems which are direct extensions of those which can be consistently formulated within conventional perturbative  $QCD$ . The presence of the large transverse momentum of a hard scattering process provides the initial justification[16] for use of the perturbative (leading log) calculations of Lipatov and others[12, 13] and it is argued[17] that the resulting “Lipatov Equation” controls, for example, the small- $x$  behavior of the parton distributions appearing in deep-inelastic scattering and even[18] that the corresponding “quark scattering amplitude” can be detected in very high energy production processes involving multiple jets. The study of the “Lipatov Pomeron”, and corrections to it, at large transverse momentum can be viewed, therefore, as a problem of summing more and more complicated diagrams within short distance, perturbative,  $QCD$ . As such, the problem may well be insurmountable (if not undefined) in its full generality.

Our objective, on the other hand, is to find the so-called “soft” Pomeron which describes, within  $QCD$ , the *low momentum transfer* high-energy scattering of *hadrons*, and satisfies all the S-Matrix constraints of *analyticity, crossing and unitarity* elaborated in Part I. Though this may appear to be an even more difficult problem it is surely well-defined. Indeed we start from essentially the same leading log perturbative calculations as in the large transverse momentum problem. However, it is important that we explicitly start in *spontaneously-broken QCD* and that we impose an *upper* transverse momentum cut-off. We keep, therefore, the momentum space region where the general Analytic Multi-Regge Theory of Part I, and in particular the closely related program of Bartels[19] (which calculates non-leading multi-regge corrections in spontaneously-broken theories directly from analyticity and unitarity) is directly applicable. In effect, we begin with the perturbative description of the (low transverse momentum) region which in the deep-inelastic problem, for example, a conventional perturbative  $QCD$  analysis would “subtract” into the non-perturbative part

of parton distribution functions[20]. However, we actually consider (multi-regge regions of) very complex multiparticle quark and gluon scattering amplitudes which lie well outside of any existing calculations within perturbative  $QCD$ . This is essential to see the emergence of confinement in our formalism.

Returning to the historical development of the subject we note that the absence of a perturbative Pomeron Regge pole in spontaneously-broken non-abelian gauge theories was seen as particularly disappointing by many theorists in that the reggeization of *all* the elementary vector bosons and fermions of the theory[21] seemed to be such a *striking verification* of the fundamental concepts of Regge theory - *in the context of field theory*. Indeed this feature apparently culminates in the complete multi-regge behavior of the *low transverse momentum* perturbative S-Matrix - with *only* reggeised quarks and gluons. The remarkable extent to which this behavior exactly reproduces the general Multi-Regge Theory results of Part I provides, from our perspective, (more than) sufficient justification for making it the starting-point of our study of the high-energy behavior of  $QCD$ .

In starting from spontaneously-broken  $QCD$ , therefore, we begin with a theory whose low momentum transfer high-energy S-Matrix is, in principle, well understood. In practise this means that we can build up the general multi-regge behavior of arbitrary amplitudes by using quark and gluon reggeon diagrams to straightforwardly extrapolate existing perturbative results. There will be *no Pomeron* in this theory. Indeed, the challenge, or effectively *our formulation of the problem of the “Pomeron in  $QCD$ ”*, is then to obtain the high-energy S-Matrix of  $QCD$  through some form of (infra-red) limiting procedure which can be legitimately applied to this known formalism and which also clearly preserves all the desirable properties. In particular if Reggeon Unitarity is to be explicitly maintained, we must find a route (via Reggeon Field Theory phase transition analysis etc.) whereby the *reggeisation of gluons and quarks* in the spontaneously-broken theory leads to the appearance of a Regge pole Pomeron (and consequent reggeon diagrams) in the *hadron* S-Matrix of pure  $QCD$ .

The part of our program which simply extends the existing perturbative calculations (of spontaneously-broken theories) by use of the reggeon diagram technology described in Part I has some significance in its own right. Although we should emphasise that the work of Bartels[19], which is conceptually very close, actually goes much further in providing detailed calculations of non-leading logarithms. However, we believe that we make fundamental progress when, as anticipated above, we introduce the abstract Super-Critical



Pomeron formalism[1] of Reggeon Field Theory to describe the infra-red limit of (perturbative) Reggeon diagrams as the gauge symmetry of  $QCD$  is *partially restored*. This provides the framework within which we can interpret the divergences that occur. It is also the key to an understanding of both the relationship between broken and unbroken  $QCD$ , and how it is possible that the abstract Pomeron of Part I, and in particular the Critical Pomeron, can emerge from the  $QCD$  starting point of a field theory of quarks and gluons. The crucial feature, which we enlarge on below, is the appearance (from the infra-red divergence structure) of a reggeon condensate which *directly converts an odd-signature reggeised gluon into an even signature Pomeron*.

The infra-red analysis we employ is conceptually elaborate in that we find it necessary to study (essentially) the complete quark/gluon multi-regge S-Matrix embedded in general multiparticle amplitudes. To understand just how the combination of massless quark interactions with the infra-red massless gluon limit does indeed produce a *confining* hadronic multi-regge S-Matrix, it is essential to *simultaneously* study the formation of hadrons, as reggeon singularities, together with the development of a Pomeron Regge pole. This requires the study of rather complicated multi-regge amplitudes and is closely related to the emphasis placed in Part I on the necessity to simultaneously study hadrons *and* the Pomeron in order to consistently describe the Super-Critical Pomeron.

The infra-red limits we study involve, of course, the decoupling of the mass-generating Higgs sector and as we have implied, this is carried out in two stages for  $QCD$ . In the first stage,  $SU(2)$  gauge symmetry is restored by decoupling just one of the two color triplet Higgs scalars employed to break the full  $SU(3)$  symmetry. It is at this stage that the presence of *massless quarks* is vital for obtaining a result consistent with confinement. The physical reason for this is actually quite simple. A physical (i.e. on-shell) massless gluon can decay into a pair of physical quarks *carrying zero transverse momentum*, whereas it can not decay into a pair of gluons because of helicity conservation. Consequently, infra-red regions of massless quark loops can lead to (reggeized) gluon interactions which do not vanish at zero transverse momentum. These interactions produce further exponentiation of those (color zero) massless gluon singularities which survive the exponentiation of divergences due to gluon reggeization. Such singularities would be inconsistent with confinement and their presence is what determines that the massless gluon theory without quarks is inconsistent.

Essential use has to be made of the structure of interactions implied by multi-regge

theory to see that this last class of interactions do not destroy the gauge invariance of the theory manifested in the reggeisation of gluons. Even though the interactions do violate properties that follow naively from the Ward Identities of the theory. We should also note that the analysis of these interactions highlights a conflict between the use of a transverse momentum cut-off, which we argue is essential as a matter of principle, and Pauli-Villars regularisation of quark transverse momentum diagrams.

The most important contribution of massless quarks is, however, in what we call the “anomalous interactions” produced by transverse momentum *quark triangle diagrams*, within certain triple-regge contributions to *multi-regge* amplitudes. In effect the Regge limit enhances the triangle diagram singularity and in doing so brings the full structure of the axial anomaly into the infra-red behavior of reggeon diagrams. We believe this *feature is what allows a spectrum consistent with confinement and chiral symmetry breaking to emerge from our analysis*. The “triangle anomaly” does not occur within triple-regge vertices that appear in the reggeon diagrams for elastic scattering or inclusive cross-section amplitudes but rather occurs in an obscure component of a general vertex that contributes only in very special kinematic limits. As a consequence the additional divergences produced do *not exponentiate* but instead are associated with the development of a zero transverse momentum configuration, or “*reggeon condensate*”, accompanying the creation of hadrons and the Pomeron. (As we elaborate there is a sense in which this can be interpreted as a generalised “winding-number condensate” [2].) The reggeon condensate is, not surprisingly, ultimately identified as the Pomeron condensate of the Super-Critical Phase [1].

It is the “triangle-anomaly” phenomenon which has caused us the greatest difficulty as we have attempted to develop our formalism over the years. We have understood for a long time that it lies at the heart of the mechanism for the development of a reggeon condensate and so is vital for the relationship between spontaneously-broken *QCD* and the Super-Critical Pomeron theory. We have described this qualitatively in numerous publications [22]. However, it is only recently that we have properly understood the relationship between the anomalous interactions and the structure of the triple-regge vertex. We believe this is the essential ingredient that enables us to both properly expose the phenomenon and to begin to analyse its full significance.

The reggeon condensate can be seen as directly responsible for confinement and chiral symmetry breaking at the first stage of symmetry restoration (that is the restoration of  $SU(2)$ )

gauge invariance). The condensate can be viewed as originating from the regularisation of the massless quark sea in the presence of the anomaly. In effect, *only* the states consistent with confinement and chiral symmetry breaking can be consistently regularised. This closely parallels the role of the regularisation of the fermion sea in the solution of the two-dimensional massless Schwinger model[2]. Indeed we find that our multi-regge infra-red analysis is both self-consistent and self-contained only when applied to  $QCD$  with the maximum number of massless fermions allowed by asymptotic freedom. In this case both the infra-red and the ultra-violet behavior of the theory are as close to perturbation theory as is possible in that there is no infra-red (or ultra-violet) growth of the gauge coupling. In field-theory language the only “non-perturbative” aspect of this theory is the contribution of topological gauge fields and the related problem of the regularisation of the fermion sea. We might anticipate therefore that, in these circumstances, any “condensate” related to gauge-fields can necessarily be thought of as topological in origin.

The restoration of  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry is achieved by the decoupling of the second Higgs scalar field. This limit involves the *disappearance of the condensate* and is described by the Critical Pomeron. Nevertheless, it is the development of the intermediate  $SU(2)$  condensate which ultimately leads to a Pomeron with all the right physical properties to give a unitary high-energy limit for  $QCD$ . The condensate directly converts an  $SU(3)$  *colored reggeized gluon* to an *even signature Pomeron Regge pole* which becomes an  $SU(3)$  *color-singlet* in the symmetry limit. In this manner the Regge behavior of (massive) gluons is *directly related* to the Regge behavior of the Pomeron. Clearly the quark sea plays an absolutely essential role in the emergence of a Regge pole Pomeron and ultimately in the asymptotic consistency of  $QCD$ . It is perhaps not surprising that the “simplest” starting point for understanding this phenomenon is when the fermion sea is most significant dynamically - that is when the maximum number of massless fermions is present. In contrast, the pure gauge theory has no fermion sea and no physically sensible Pomeron. Consequently it is not a good starting point for understanding the vacuum properties of the theory related to the Pomeron.

It is also interesting that the method of analysis can be extended to a general  $SU(N)$  gauge group. The existence of  $N - 2$  Pomeron trajectories comes perhaps as a surprise given the simple relationship expected between the  $1/N$  expansion and Reggeon Field Theory. As we describe, the spectrum of trajectories can be directly understood in terms of the topological properties of transverse flux-tubes determined by the center of the gauge group[23].

However, it should be emphasised that this structure only emerges as significant when there are a large number of fermions in the theory. The special relationship between the Critical Pomeron and  $SU(3)$  gauge invariance may have profound significance in that it could imply that  $QCD$  really is uniquely selected as describing the *maximal strong interaction consistent with unitarity*. The flavor dependence could also be significant for understanding how  $QCD$  should be defined as a matter of principle and also whether a further very massive quark sector, perhaps associated with electroweak symmetry breaking, is actually required for asymptotic consistency.

## 2. SUMMARY

We have three presentational goals. We want to present the results of our own research, to provide some review of the material which defines the context of our work, and also to provide enough development that a newcomer to the field can use the article as a learning vehicle and reference guide. There is clearly potential for conflict in these goals, which we shall try as far as possible to resolve. It will, however, mean that there is an uneven oscillation from Section to Section in terms of the level of presentation, the proportion of new to review material etc.. We should apologise for the extreme length of the article. Unfortunately we have developed most of the material simultaneously and feel that it would be very hard to break it up without losing the cohesion and inter-relation of the various components. There are also a number of places where we feel the overall strengths of the argument we are making may be better than the details we formulate. To understand this it is essential to keep in mind the global perspective which the complete article provides. We hope that the lengthy summary which we give in the following goes some way in mitigating the negative effects of the overall length.

We begin in Section 3 with a brief description of some general reasons why we would expect that if a Regge pole Pomeron appears in  $QCD$  at all, then the Critical behavior will occur when the theory contains the maximal number of hadronic states. This corresponds to adding the maximal number of quark flavors without losing asymptotic freedom. As we then elaborate there are a number of field-theoretic properties of this “saturated” theory which make it compatible with Critical Pomeron behavior and with the property that a Super-Critical Pomeron condensate will develop if a Higgs sector is added. That the Pomeron condensate might be “topological” in origin and related to the regularisation of the fermion sea is even suggested by the general field-theoretic properties we discuss. This Section makes no use of reggeon diagrams and is intended to prepare the reader for the results that emerge from the more technical analysis of later Sections.

To begin our review of the Regge properties of spontaneously-broken gauge theories, the t-channel unitarity analysis[21] of the general reggeization of all elementary fermions and vector bosons in a non-abelian theory is briefly described in Section 4. This analysis is complimentary to almost all of the diagrammatic analysis and development of the succeeding Sections. We include it for completeness and also because of its simple elegance and

generality. We also emphasise that the Regge poles produced by reggeization in field theory are isolated in the angular-momentum plane. As a result they are better candidates to link up with the isolated Regge poles of an effective string theory (describing the confining flux-tube solution of a gauge theory) than the typical spectrum of bound state Regge poles. The isolation property also allows reggeized gluons (or quarks) and their associated Regge cuts to be responsible for the *complete* leading power behavior (that is including *all* logarithms) of a theory at high energy.

The detailed program of constructing perturbative multi-regge behavior is begun in Section 5. We discuss the general reduction of Feynman diagrams to transverse momentum diagrams in the Regge limit. We begin with the simplest scalar box diagram. We then move on to low-order diagrams in an abelian gauge theory (massive  $QED$ ), where the elaborate large transverse momentum cancellations that characterise a gauge theory can be most simply illustrated. We then present the results of the 10th order leading and non-leading log calculations of Cheng and Lo[13] for  $SU(2)$  gauge theory. We emphasise the origin of the leading-log reggeization of the gluon in the “close-to” on mass-shell regions of ladder diagrams. The unitarity plus dispersion relation derivation of these results by Lipatov and collaborators[12, 14] is then reviewed to prepare for the general insight that is derived from this approach in the following Section. We also mention, but do not review, the all-orders (of leading log and non-leading logs) formalism of Sen[24]. His results guarantee that transverse momentum diagrams fully describe the leading power (plus all logs) Regge limit of a gauge theory.

The organisation of transverse momentum diagrams into the reggeon diagram language of Part I is the subject of Section 6. The 10th order  $SU(2)$  results (originating from several hundred Feynman diagrams) can be rewritten as just five reggeon diagrams. We discuss why unitarity requires that this must be the case, and how the Lipatov et al. method[12, 14] (and its extension by Bartels[19]) leads to the complete multi-regge behavior of all leading and non-leading log multiparticle amplitudes. We then show that all of the reggeon diagrams that occur conform with the general formalism of Part I in the simplest possible manner. That is the diagrams are reproduced by a construction procedure based on reggeon unitarity which employs only the simplest form for reggeon vertices. We take this to mean that we can straightforwardly extrapolate the existing results to the most general amplitudes and multi-regge limits.

In Section 7 we begin to move outside the perturbative multi-regge framework of the previous Sections by discussing one of the basic questions of principle posed in the Introduction. Namely are there conditions under which we can reach the high-energy Regge limit of unbroken (confining) QCD, starting from (one of) the spontaneously-broken theories that we apparently have under such good control. The lattice gauge theory principle of complementarity[25] provides the basic answer. This tells us that, with a *transverse momentum cut-off*, and with *fundamental representation* Higgs scalars used to first give gluons a mass, and then decoupled to remove this mass, there is *no confinement phase-transition*. That is the “Higgs” and “confinement” regions of parameter space are *smoothly* related. The second question we pose is whether the smooth transition from a perturbative massive gluon theory to a confining massless gluon theory can be followed (even in principle) in the high-energy reggeon diagrams. We first discuss the dynamical significance of transverse momentum divergences in *QED* and then argue that *if the gauge-coupling of a non-abelian theory does not grow in the infra-red region* then such divergences can be the origin of the transition to a confining theory. Eliminating the growth of the gauge coupling provides our first motivation for the introduction of massless fermions.

Our infra-red analysis of reggeon diagrams starts in Section 8 by analysing the  $SU(2)$  theory with reggeized gluons only. In this analysis the significance of reggeization is that it produces a “*t*-channel” exponentiation (in rapidity space) of infra-red divergences. By relating this exponentiation to the inversion of reggeon singularities (in the angular momentum plane) due to reggeon unitarity, we show that it simply sends to zero, all reggeon diagrams which carry *non-zero (total) color* in the *t*-channel. In color zero channels the divergences cancel and instead there is a set of infra-red finite, scaling, reggeon interactions and off-shell amplitudes. However, because the reggeon interactions vanish whenever any sub-set of the interacting reggeons carries zero transverse momentum, (this is the Ward-Identity property referred to in the Introduction), there are infra-red divergences of color-zero on mass-shell (gluon) scattering amplitudes which are not inverted. As a result the “pure-gluon” reggeon S-Matrix does not have a sensible infra-red limit. We note that the scale-invariance property of the color-zero kernels can be used to generate the large transverse momentum “Lipatov Pomeron” singularity referred to in the Introduction by first removing the transverse momentum cut-off and then taking the infra-red limit. We argue that, for our purposes, this is the *wrong-order* in which to *take limits* and that this is why a finite (with suitable scattering states) but *non-unitary* result is obtained.

We finally introduce reggeized quarks into our discussion in Section 9. We note first that in the leading-log approximation quarks have analogous reggeization and multiperipheral bootstrap properties[26] to gluons. We also note that the zero-mass limit for quarks is smooth and does not destroy their reggeization properties. We then go on to discuss the contribution of quark-loops to reggeized gluon vertices. In  $QED$ , electron loops provide the leading-log interactions for the iteration of photon pair exchange. The analogous quark loop interactions are buried at non-leading log level in a non-abelian theory. However, we show that there is a vital new reggeized gluon interaction due to the exchange of a colored quark/antiquark pair which is a well-defined leading-log Regge region contribution. With massless quarks and a transverse momentum cut-off this interaction necessarily eliminates the “Ward-Identity” zeroes discussed in the previous paragraph. Almost all gluon infra-red divergences are now inverted (or exponentiated in rapidity space). We then note that the *infra-red* scaling properties of the color zero kernels could produce further divergences which *are not inverted* if the gluons involved form an odd-signature “Odderon” configuration which has “*anomalous color-charge parity*” - that is the gluons form an “anomalous Odderon”. However, we show that such a configuration can not appear at all in the theory unless there are *divergent* massless quark transverse momentum loops to which it can couple.

Section 10 contains, perhaps, the most fundamental new result that we derive. We begin with what is essentially an omission from Part I, that is a discussion of triple-Regge limits and the structure of the triple-Regge vertex. We recall that this vertex is a sum[27] of three familiar terms (which appear in inclusive cross-sections and in elastic scattering reggeon diagrams) and a fourth somewhat mysterious term which appears only in *strictly multiparticle* helicity-pole and triple-Regge limits. This term has previously seemed to be of academic significance only. However, when we ask whether an infra-red reggeon diagram divergence involving (simultaneously) three quark propagators can occur, we find that it requires a very particular discontinuity (and helicity) structure. This implies that such a divergence can occur in (and only in) the “mysterious” fourth term of the triple-Regge vertex. This result is (not surprisingly) closely connected to the helicity and momentum structure of the triangle anomaly. The important point for our analysis is that it immediately follows that the “anomalous Odderon” gluon configuration *will couple* via this anomaly and the resulting divergence *will not be inverted* via reggeon interactions. This implies that this divergence can be interpreted as associated with a *reggeon condensate*. Furthermore this condensate is clearly linked to the anomaly and the massless fermion sea. We reserve further explanation of



the significance of this relationship until after we discuss the Schwinger model in Section 11. We finish the Section by describing further anomalous interactions involving the production (or absorption) of a massive gluon reggeon pair or the emission (or absorption) of a zero transverse momentum anomalous odderon configuration from a quark/antiquark reggeon state.

The construction of the high-energy S-Matrix for  $SU(2)$  gauge theory (with many fermions) is the subject of Section 11. We first summarise essential results established in the previous Sections and then discuss, qualitatively at least, how the full set of multi-regge amplitudes generates the physical spectrum of reggeon (and therefore particle) states together with the physical S-Matrix. Indeed with just  $SU(2)$  gauge symmetry *there is no Pomeron* and the only surviving reggeon states are *pseudoscalar mesons* formed by quark/antiquark reggeons in the background of the reggeon condensate. In effect we have a *confining (and chiral symmetry breaking) spectrum and a non-interacting Regge limit S-Matrix*. In order to emphasise the close parallels that can be made we then go on to present a brief review of the relationship between the fermion sea, confinement, and a winding number condensate, in the two-dimensional Schwinger model[2]. In particular we note the parallel between confinement at zero and non-zero electron mass in the Schwinger model, and at infinite and finite momentum in  $QCD$ .

In Section 12 we finally begin explicit discussion of  $QCD$ , beginning with the construction of the reggeon diagrams when the gauge symmetry is completely broken with the aid of two color triplets of Higgs scalars. An  $SU(2)$  global symmetry again remains and is the “color” that is ultimately confined by our infra-red analysis. We give an outline of how, as  $SU(2)$  gauge symmetry is restored, the anomaly divergences both *convert an  $SU(2)$  singlet reggeized gluon to an even signature Pomeron* and build up the full structure of the Super-Critical Pomeron. In this theory we have a very interesting “Parton-Model” picture in which there are  $SU(2)$  color singlet reggeized gluons and quarks which have elementary interactions but their Reggeon signature properties are transformed by the condensate. In particular we have an even signature Pomeron which couples[28] “just like a photon”.

Section 13 begins with a description of how the Super-Critical Pomeron gives the Critical Pomeron as  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry is restored. We emphasize the role played by color charge parity in determining, in particular, that there are no “glueballs” on the Pomeron trajectory. No transverse cut-off is required if the maximum number of quark

flavors is present. If there are fewer flavors present we argue that the Critical Pomeron can still be obtained with a specific *critical* value of the cut-off. (We postpone discussion of the significance of this result until Section 14.) We then go on to extend the analysis to  $SU(N)$  gauge theory and explain how the special properties of the  $SU(3)$  gauge group lead to the presence of a single Regge pole Pomeron. We do this by relating the number of Pomeron trajectories built up, by our symmetry restoration procedure, to the role of the center of the gauge group in determining the transverse flux-tube structure that is possible with  $SU(N)$  gauge fields and in determining the Reggeon Field Theory cutting-rules that we expect. The conclusion is that there are  $N - 2$  trajectories, with alternating signatures, in  $SU(N)$  gauge theory and the number that are critical depends on how close the fermion flavor number is to "saturation".

Finally we discuss in Section 14 how we relate all of our work to the physical world as we currently understand it. We begin with a brief description of how we think our results relate to the current phenomenological understanding of the Pomeron. We then consider implications for the construction of the theory with a small number of flavors. We also discuss how a flavor-doublet of color sextet quarks could both complete the "flavor-saturation" of  $QCD$  (producing the Critical Pomeron) and be responsible for dynamical electroweak symmetry breaking[29]. We conclude by briefly elaborating how generalised Super-Critical Pomeron theory may be the appropriate formalism to analyse the dynamical solution of (particular) unified gauge theories.

### 3. QCD AND THE CRITICAL POMERON - GENERAL ARGUMENTS

We present in this Section some general arguments which support our expectations as to how and why the Critical Pomeron occurs in  $QCD$  but which do not require the full technology of gauge theory reggeon diagrams which we develop in succeeding Sections. We shall find that we are rather straightforwardly led towards the physics that the Critical and Super-Critical Pomeron are associated with.

First let us suppose only that  $QCD$  is indeed a theory of hadrons and that *low transverse momentum* hadron production is described by Pomeron diagrams as outlined in I-6.8. To support this assumption we can appeal to a “ $1/N$ ” or “topological” expansion of the theory[30], or to the closely related idea that an effective closed string theory of flux tubes describes the Pomeron in  $QCD$ . Within the resulting “multiperipheral” model, it is straightforward to show[31] that increasing the number of hadron states increases the “bare” Pomeron intercept. Therefore we anticipate that within  $QCD$ , “flavoring the Pomeron” by increasing the number of quark flavors directly increases the bare intercept. Consequently, if we can establish that the Pomeron is Sub-Critical for some specific number of flavors then we can move towards the Critical theory simply by increasing this number.

We also know from the (Reggeon Field Theory) weak-coupling formula[32] given in Part I that increasing the transverse momentum cut-off increases the bare *critical* intercept. This implies that by raising this cut-off, while keeping the other parameters of the theory fixed, we can move towards, or further into, the Sub-Critical Phase. It is therefore very reasonable that the theory with a small number of flavors will be Sub-Critical, if the transverse cut-off is taken *sufficiently large*. If this is the case then we can indeed expect to approach the Critical Pomeron by increasing the number of quark flavors. However,  $QCD$  is not expected to significantly depend on the flavor number until it radically changes its character as asymptotic freedom is lost. Therefore a natural point for the Critical behaviour to occur would be just at the maximum number of flavors allowed by asymptotic freedom (referred to as “flavor saturation” in the following). Indeed there are further general arguments that it is “flavor-saturated  $QCD$ ” that gives the Critical Pomeron, as we now describe.

A special property of flavor-saturated  $QCD$  is[33, 34] that a (complex) color-triplet

Higgs scalar sector can be added - with both the gauge-coupling *and* the Higgs self-coupling asymptotically free. Let  $g(t)$  and  $h(t)$  be the respective scale-dependent couplings, then

$$\frac{dg}{dt} = \beta(g, h) \quad (3.1)$$

$$= -\frac{1}{2}b_0t^3 + \dots \quad (3.2)$$

where

$$b_0 = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[ 11 - \frac{4}{3}S_3(f) - \frac{1}{6} \right] \quad (3.3)$$

The  $1/6$  is due to the triplet scalar and  $S_3(f)$  depends on the number (and representation) of the quarks present. Similarly

$$\frac{dh}{dt} = \tilde{\beta}(g, h) \quad (3.4)$$

$$= Ah^2 + Bg^2 + Cg^4 + \dots \quad (3.5)$$

where

$$A = \frac{7}{8\pi^2}, \quad B = -\frac{1}{\pi^2} \quad \text{and} \quad C = \frac{13}{48\pi^2}. \quad (3.6)$$

We can have  $h \rightarrow 0$  consistently in (3.5) if  $h = xg^2 + 0(g^3)$ . This gives a stability equation for  $x$ , that is

$$\frac{dx}{dt} = g^2 (Ax^2 + B'x + C) \quad (3.7)$$

where  $B' = B + b_0$ . When the stability condition  $(B')^2 > 4AC$  is satisfied there are two fixed-points of (3.7) and the smaller is stable for  $t \rightarrow \infty$ . The stability condition gives

$$(1 - \pi^2 b_0)^2 > \frac{91}{96} \quad (3.8)$$

which for  $b_0$  small gives

$$\frac{5}{24} > 8\pi^2 b_0 \quad (3.9)$$

If all quarks are color triplets then  $S_3(f) = N_f/2$ , where  $N_f$  is the number of flavors. We now observe that if  $N_f = 16$  then

$$8\pi^2 b_0 = \frac{1}{6} < \frac{5}{24} \quad (3.10)$$

whereas if  $N_f = 15$  then

$$8\pi^2 b_0 = \frac{5}{6} > \frac{5}{24} \quad (3.11)$$

We conclude that when the number of flavors saturates at exactly 16 we can use the Higgs mechanism to break the  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry to  $SU(2)$  and so smoothly introduce a (single) massive vector into the theory while *maintaining* the short-distance asymptotic freedom of the theory.

We now recall from Part I that the Super-Critical Pomeron phase is characterized by the smooth entry into the theory of a massive reggeized vector particle. Equivalently, as the critical behavior is approached from the Super-Critical phase a (reggeized) vector particle becomes massless and smoothly decouples from the theory just at the critical point. The above analysis shows that *just* at the flavor saturation point, a smooth parameter variation can indeed introduce a massive vector into the theory via the Higgs mechanism, without destroying the ultra-violet properties of the theory. This argument - based on properties of the Super-Critical Phase - provides a remarkable confirmation of the previous argument (which is totally independent in that it is based on properties of the Sub-Critical Phase) that the critical theory should be flavor-saturated  $QCD$ . Also, we already see some motivation for the suggestion made in Part 1, that partially-broken  $QCD$  can be identified with the Super-Critical Pomeron phase containing a vector reggeon degenerate with the Pomeron. Indeed, we emphasize that flavor-saturated  $QCD$  is the *simplest* gauge theory[33, 34] to which an asymptotically free Higgs sector can be added, and a massive vector introduced via the partial spontaneous breaking of the gauge symmetry.

Consider now what the role of quark masses might be with respect to the nature of the Pomeron. To the extent that the quark mass scale is directly related to that of the hadron spectrum, we would expect this scale to be relevant only in determining the energy and momentum transfer scales at which the asymptotic behavior due to the Pomeron sets in. We would not expect the functional form of the asymptotic behavior to be directly affected by smooth variation of the quark mass scale. From this point of view lowering the quark mass scale would simply be expected to bring down the scale of “asymptopia”. Of course, the asymptotic behavior can be singular in the massless limit and indeed we would expect that asymptotic properties are most likely to be directly related to finite energy properties of the theory when all quarks are massless. It is interesting therefore to consider specific properties of flavor-saturated  $QCD$  which hold only if the quarks are massless.

A vital property can be seen by studying the three-loop  $\beta$ -function. In  $QCD$  with sixteen flavors of quarks the  $\beta$ -function (in the momentum subtraction scheme) is[35]

$$\beta(g) = \frac{g^3}{16\pi^2} \left[ \beta_0 + \beta_1 \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} + \beta_2 \frac{g^4}{(16\pi^2)^2} + \dots \right] \quad (3.12)$$

where

$$\beta_0 = \frac{1}{3}, \quad \beta_1 = -137^{1/3} \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_2 \left( \frac{\beta_0}{\beta_1} \right)^2 \sim 0.01. \quad (3.13)$$

Keeping only the first two terms in (3.12), there is a zero of  $\beta(g)$  at

$$\alpha_s = \frac{g^2}{4\pi} = \frac{-4\pi\beta_0}{\beta_1} = \frac{4\pi}{412} \sim \frac{1}{33}. \quad (3.14)$$

The smallness of the third-term in (3.12) when (3.14) is satisfied, is emphasized by both (the last part) of (3.13) and by noting that the expansion parameter of (3.12) is actually

$$\frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \sim \frac{1}{412}, \quad (3.15)$$

Consequently it is clear that the zero should survive to very high order in the perturbation expansion and therefore should be present in any reasonable non-perturbative definition of  $\beta(g)$ . A more formal version of this argument can be given[36] by making an “ $\epsilon$ -expansion” with

$$\epsilon = \left[ 16\frac{1}{2} - N_F \right], \quad (3.16)$$

where  $N_F$  is the number of flavors and  $16\frac{1}{2}$  is the value of  $N_F$  at which asymptotic freedom is lost. It can then be argued that a zero of  $\beta(g, \epsilon)$  is present for sufficiently small  $\epsilon$  and persists to at least  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{2}$ .

If all the quarks are massless, then the zero of  $\beta(g)$  is a genuine infra-red fixed-point and so implies that  $g$  *does not evolve* in the infra-red region. Although we have specifically argued for the zero in the case  $N_F = 16$ , the same phenomena can also be produced[34] by adding a much smaller number of higher color fermions. In particular, if we consider that five conventional quark flavors have been discovered, then a  $\beta$ -function almost identical to

(3.12) is produced by

$$\left. \begin{array}{ll} \text{i)} & 6 \text{ color triplet quarks} + 2 \text{ color sextet quarks} \\ \text{ii)} & 5 \text{ color triplet quarks} + 1 \text{ color sextet quark} + 1 \text{ color octet quark.} \end{array} \right\} \quad (3.17)$$

As we shall review in Section 14, possibility i) is actually physically realistic if color sextet chiral symmetry breaking is the mechanism for breaking the electroweak gauge symmetry[29]. There may also be, as we briefly discuss in Section 14, a deeper reason why a higher color sector is necessary - involving the “Strong  $CP$ ” problem. Therefore it will be particularly important that “flavor-saturated  $QCD$ ” could refer to option i) above. However, for much of this article we shall, for simplicity, refer only to the “unrealistic” sixteen triplet quark flavor theory as the “saturated” theory. If the sextet quark option is not utilized by nature, the sixteen triplet theory may still be a good theoretical starting point from which to understand the Pomeron in  $QCD$  with only a small number of flavors.

The infra-red fixed point of massless, saturated,  $QCD$  also has a potential direct relationship to Critical Pomeron behavior as we now discuss. To see this we first consider the infrequently discussed “strong-coupling” limit of the Critical Diffraction peak[32]. The scaling property I-(6.48) of the elastic differential cross-section can be written in two closely related forms, that is

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dt} \underset{s \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} [(lns)^\eta f(t(lns)^\nu/K)]^2 \quad (3.18)$$

$$= [t^\delta g(t(lns)^\nu/K)]^2 \quad (3.19)$$

where  $\nu\delta + \eta = 0$ . (3.19) is much less familiar than (3.18). (3.18) is most commonly used because the finiteness of  $f(0)$  gives directly the prediction of an increasing total cross-section. However,  $g(\infty)$  is also finite, while  $f(\infty)$  and  $g(0)$  are not. Therefore if we wish to study the limit  $K \rightarrow 0$ , for example, then (3.19) is what we should use. This gives

$$\frac{d\sigma}{dt} \underset{K \rightarrow 0}{\rightarrow} t^{2\delta} [g(\infty)]^2 \quad (3.20)$$

Since

$$K = (\alpha'_0)^\nu / r_0^{2\nu-2} \quad (3.21)$$

it follows that (3.20) will, in particular, be the result of the “strong-coupling” limit  $r_0 \rightarrow \infty$ . That is in this limit the diffraction peak shrinks to zero width and gives a *vector-like* singularity, with an anomalous dimension, at  $t = 0$ .

In general, massless (quark)  $N_f$ -flavor  $QCD$  is expected to correspond to a chiral limit of the massive theory in which all pseudoscalar (Goldstone boson) masses go to zero. Since we expect the scale of the triple Pomeron coupling  $r_0$  (which has the dimension  $[\text{mass}]^{-1}$ ) to be set by the lightest particle in the theory we anticipate that this chiral limit will give  $r_0 \rightarrow \infty$ . If the slope parameter  $\alpha'_0$  remains finite (or has a much milder divergence) then we have the strong-coupling limit discussed above. If the theory is at the Critical Point then the vector-like singularity of the diffraction peak discussed above must be a property of the massless chiral limit we are considering. Given the infra-red fixed point discussed above, we anticipate that the  $\beta$ -function for massless  $QCD$  evolves as a function of the number of flavors as illustrated in Fig. 3.1. The vector-like singularity (with anomalous dimensions) that we are looking for should then appear in amplitudes as *a natural consequence of the infra-red scaling associated with the fixed-point*. This again would happen just at the flavor saturation point. Once again, therefore, we are led to the conclusion that properties of the Critical Pomeron match closely with those of “flavor-saturated  $QCD$ ”.

It is important to note that properties of the infra-red fixed point could be related to properties of chiral limits in a variety of indirect ways. We noted in Part I that Adler zeroes could be directly related to Critical Pomeron modifications of Regge residue functions. It is clearly plausible that such zeroes could be related to infra-red anomalous dimensions associated with the fixed point. Note also that we expect the strong-coupling limit  $r_0 \rightarrow \infty$  to result from the vanishing of any pseudoscalar mass and so to be a property of any chiral limit in flavor-saturated  $QCD$ . That is to say that if all quark masses are initially non-zero (so that the complete  $SU(16) \otimes SU(16)$  chiral symmetry is broken) and then a chiral  $SU(2) \otimes SU(2)$  symmetry limit is taken, the strong coupling limit of the Critical Pomeron will necessarily be involved and so can produce the same infra-red effects as in the completely massless (saturated) theory. If the Critical Pomeron does play the crucial role in chiral limits that we are suggesting, then this implies that massive (as yet undiscovered) quarks are actually important (via the mixture of infra-red and ultra-violet effects in the form of the Critical Pomeron) in the way the chiral limit is realised for massless pions.

As we now discuss, there is an additional theoretical significance to saturating  $QCD$



with massless quarks which will eventually enable us to understand why, in this case, we may be able to construct the Pomeron from gluon reggeon diagrams. To see this it will be useful to first recall why, in general, we can not define *QCD* from perturbation theory. That is we discuss the “wild divergence” of the perturbation series due to vacuum fluctuations.

The existence of series of vacuum self-energy diagrams, such as that illustrated in Fig. 3.2, within the perturbation expansion for general amplitudes gives rise to series having the qualitative form

$$f(g^2) = \sum_n a_n (g^2)^n \int_o \frac{dp}{p} (\ln p)^n p^m \quad (3.22)$$

$$\sim \sum_n a_n (g^2/m)^n n! \quad (3.23)$$

where, as we have illustrated, the  $n!$  in (3.23) arises from integration over the infrared region of momenta. The nature of the divergence (3.21) is characterized by transforming to the Borel plane. That is we write

$$f(g^2) = \int_o^\infty db e^{-b/g^2} \tilde{f}(b) \quad (3.24)$$

where  $\tilde{f}(b)$  will have the same perturbation expansion (in powers of  $b$ ) as (3.23) but without the  $n!$  factors. It can then be shown[37, 38] that in general amplitudes, series of sub-diagrams, such as those of Fig. 3.2, lead to a sequence of “renormalon” branch-points in the  $b$ -plane (as illustrated in Fig. 3.3) at  $b = b_1, b = b_2, \dots$ , whose discontinuities are proportional to gluon vacuum condensates i.e.

$$\text{residue at } b = b_1 \sim \langle 0 | F_{\mu\nu}^2 | 0 \rangle \quad (3.25)$$

$$\text{residue at } b = b_2 \sim \langle 0 | F_{\mu\nu}^4 | 0 \rangle \quad (3.26)$$

etc.

Because of the presence of the renormalon singularities the integration in the Borel representation (3.24) is not uniquely determined (the theory is not Borel summable). Indeed condensates such as (3.25), (3.26) etc. are also not uniquely determined[38] (since they do

not characterize the breaking of any symmetry) but rather in any particular renormalization scheme they characterize the non-perturbative ambiguity of the theory. In particular if we wish to study the low  $p_\perp$  Pomeron in terms of conventional perturbative gluon exchange we can expect that gluon condensates will have to be invoked in a vital manner (as, for example, in the work of Landshoff and Nachtmann[39]).

Consider now the effect of increasing the number of flavors of massless quarks. As is now (we hope) very clear, we anticipate that this will be related to the Pomeron approaching criticality. As  $N_f$  increases, the renormalon singularities move to the right in the Borel plane and expose multi-instanton singularities as illustrated in Fig. 3.4. (The first renormalon singularity occurs at  $b = b_1 = 24\pi/(33 - 2N_f)$ , whereas the first instanton/anti-instanton singularity occurs at  $b = 4\pi$ ). When  $N_f$  reaches the flavor-saturation point, the first renormalon discontinuity is known to vanish[38] and the expectation is that the renormalons disappear completely leaving only the “topological” multi-instanton singularities. This occurs simultaneously with the development of the infra-red fixed-point in the  $\beta$ -function discussed above. For the present discussion the most important property of the fixed-point is the implication that the infrared contributions of the massless quarks exactly cancel those of gluons to prevent the growth of the gauge-coupling in the infrared region.

We conclude therefore that when  $N_f$  is a maximum the  $QCD$  perturbation expansion is much less divergent. Also the “non-perturbative vacuum problem”, characterized by the array of gluon condensates discussed above, reduces to the simpler problem of the effects of topological fields and the related problem of the regularization of the massless quark sea in the presence of the anomaly. We can hope therefore that, in principle at least, this simplification could allow us to calculate the Pomeron by summing multi-gluon exchanges (together with the careful removal of cut-offs and exploitation of unitarity via reggeon diagrams that we will be discussing in the following). If this is the case, the remaining “non-perturbative” effects, namely instanton interactions, must (as we discuss again in Section 11) be introduced by the process of infinite summation and removal of cut-offs. However, we can anticipate that if we utilize a large number of massless quarks to “simplify” our problem, it must be that all the dynamical issues of confinement etc. are shifted to those problems which are enhanced by the presence of the extra fermions. This can only be the problem of the effects of instantons and their relation to the regularization of the quark sea. Therefore this problem must enter our analysis at some point, at least indirectly, if we are indeed confronting the basic vacuum

properties of the theory.

This last discussion gives us our first glimpse of what the physics of the Critical Pomeron could be associated with. We see that the “saturation” of  $QCD$  with quarks leads naturally to the dominance of “topological” problems connected to the anomaly and the regularization of the quark sea. In the example of the Schwinger model, which we discuss at length in a Section 11, it is well known[2] that this problem leads to the development of a “winding-number” vacuum condensate. Perhaps then the Super-Critical Pomeron condensate that is produced as we go through the critical point (by adding more and more quarks) can be seen as a “topological condensate” resulting from the dominance of the divergence of the quark sea. After much technical development and analysis of reggeon diagrams in the following Sections we shall eventually be able to realise this idea explicitly.

## 4. ELASTIC UNITARITY AND THE REGGEIZATION OF NON-ABELIAN THEORIES

In Section I-5.1 we discussed the general relationship between two-particle unitarity (in the t-channel) and Regge pole trajectories. In this Section we begin our description of the Regge properties of non-abelian gauge theories by briefly reviewing the argument[21] that in a general *renormalizable*, spontaneously-broken, *non-abelian* gauge theory (in which *all* gauge bosons acquire a mass), the two-particle unitarity approximation shows that *all* vector bosons and fermions (corresponding to the elementary fields of the theory) lie on Regge trajectories. However, this analysis is not sufficient to demonstrate that there are *no additional trajectories* in the neighborhood of  $J = 1$  or  $J = 1/2$ . This requires the high-order leading-log calculations which we describe in later Sections. Indeed, the weakness of the two-particle unitarity analysis is that it is vulnerable, in higher orders, to an *overestimate* of the number of Regge poles that are present - in particular by suggesting the misidentification of Regge cut terms as Regge poles.

As we noted in the Summary, it will be an important part of our argument in subsequent sections that the *only* Regge poles in the theory are those of the elementary fields, and that multiparticle t-channel unitarity is *completely* accounted for by the Regge cuts generated by such Regge poles. We emphasize that the reggeization of an elementary particle of the theory is the only known mechanism within field theory for generating a Regge pole trajectory which is isolated in the manner that we would like the Pomeron to be isolated in *QCD*. Bound state Regge pole trajectories are typically generated in infinite sets with accumulations points of trajectories etc..

The essential ingredients of reggeization are the existence of “nonsense” states - as defined in I - due to the presence of vector particles and the dispersive N/D solution of elastic unitarity. If we consider vector-vector scattering in the t-channel then at  $J = 1$  we can (by choosing the external helicities to sum to the sense values of  $n = -1, 0, 1$ , or the nonsense values of  $n = -2, 2$ ) identify physical sense/sense amplitudes  $-A_{ss}$ , and by Froissart-Gribov (FG) analytic continuation, the unphysical sense/nonsense amplitudes  $-A_{sn}$ , and nonsense/nonsense amplitudes  $-A_{nn}$ . Because of the nonsense square-root branch-points discussed in I-4.5, these amplitudes have the following form near  $J = 1$

$$A_{ss} = V_{ss}(t)\delta_{J,1} + \cdots \quad (4.1)$$

$$A_{sn} = V_{sn}(t)/(J-1)^{\frac{1}{2}} + \dots \quad (4.2)$$

$$A_{nn} = V_{nn}(t)/(J-1) + \dots \quad (4.3)$$

In lowest-order perturbation theory

$$V_{ss}(t) = g^2/(t - M^2) \quad (4.4)$$

where  $M$  is the vector-meson mass (which for simplicity we temporarily take to be common for all vectors).

The  $J = 1$  singularity of  $A_{nn}$  acts as a “driving” potential in the analytically-continued elastic unitarity equation I-(5.19) and taking the simplest N/D solution gives for the analytically continued  $A_{ss}$

$$A_{ss}(t, J) = -V_{sn}K [J - 1 - V_{nn}K]^{-1} V_{ns} \quad (4.5)$$

where

$$K(t) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int \frac{dt' \rho(t')}{(t' - t)} \quad (4.6)$$

and  $\rho(t)$  is a phase-space factor. (4.5) generates a Regge pole trajectory

$$\alpha(t) = 1 + V_{nn}(t)K(t) \quad (4.7)$$

and is consistent with (4.1) if

$$V_{ss} = V_{sn} [V_{nn}]^{-1} V_{ns} \quad (4.8)$$

which is the well-known “factorization” condition for reggeization. In particular (4.4) requires that  $V_{nn}$  has a zero at the vector particle pole, or (if there are distinct masses  $M_v$ )

$$V_{nn}^{-1} = \sum_v R_v/(t - M_v^2) \quad (4.9)$$

$V_{nn}$  is calculated from the lowest order Feynman diagrams, and after some lengthy calculation it can be shown[21] that for vectors a,b,c,d in a theory with (broken) gauge symmetry group G

$$(V_{nn})_{ab,cd} = \sum_e [C_{abe} C_{cde}] (t - M_e^2) \quad (4.10)$$

where the  $C_{abe}$  are structure constants of the group G. This is sufficient to give the factorization condition (4.8) and (4.9) in the vector adjoint representation of G *provided* that G

is semi-simple. That is  $G$  should have no abelian subgroups. Therefore the (massive) gauge bosons of a general non-abelian group do indeed reggeize. A very similar argument can be given to show that the elementary fermions of the theory also reggeize.

The strength of the above argument is that it is straightforward to carry through for a general gauge group and also for fermions in general representations. It's weakness is that it anticipates particular  $N/D$  Regge pole contributions to amplitudes and if the process is extended to non-leading order or to lower values of  $J$  then ambiguities arise (CDD ambiguities in particular) which can lead to conflicting results or, (as we discuss in Section 6) the misidentification of Regge cut contributions as additional Regge poles. However, all existing explicit calculations of high-energy logarithms are consistent with the general reggeization of elementary gauge bosons and fermions described above.

## 5. TRANSVERSE MOMENTUM DIAGRAMS IN GAUGE THEORIES

In this Section we begin our summary of what we shall need to know about the perturbative high-energy behavior of gauge theories. Our basic purpose, in this and the next Section, will be to demonstrate that the great complexity of the Feynman perturbation expansion in (spontaneously broken) gauge theories reduces, in the Regge limit, to the simplest structures expected from the general Regge theory we have described in Part I. The contributions of internal fermion loops will be of special importance in our analysis but we will postpone their discussion until later Sections.

We begin by giving a brief overview of the reduction of Feynman diagrams to transverse momentum diagrams in the Regge limit. In the next Section we shall describe the organisation of transverse momentum diagrams into reggeon diagrams.

### 5.1 Transverse Momentum Diagrams

Consider first the box-diagram[40] illustrated in Fig. 5.1. We shall initially neglect numerators so that we have, in the notation illustrated,

$$\begin{aligned}
 I(s, t, m^2) = & \int d^4k \left[ k^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1} \left[ \left( p_1 - \frac{q}{2} - k \right)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1} \\
 & \times \left[ (q + k)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1} \left[ \left( p_2 + \frac{q}{2} + k \right)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1}.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{5.1}$$

If we write

$$p_1 = \left( \sqrt{s/2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\right), \sqrt{\frac{s}{2}}, 0 \right) \tag{5.2}$$

$$p_2 = \left( \sqrt{s/2} + O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\right), -\sqrt{\frac{s}{2}}, 0 \right) \tag{5.3}$$

$$q = \left( O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\right), O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{s}}\right), \underline{q} \right) \quad q^2 = t \tag{5.4}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_{s \rightarrow \infty} \simeq & \frac{1}{2} \int d^2 \underline{k}_\perp dk_+ dk_- \left[ k_+ k_- - k_\perp^2 + m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1} \left[ \left( k_+ - \sqrt{2s} \right) k_- \right. \\
& \left. - \left( \underline{q}_\perp / 2 + \underline{k}_\perp \right)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1} \left[ k_+ k_- - \left( \underline{q}_\perp + \underline{k}_\perp \right)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1} | \\
& \times \left[ k_+ \left( \sqrt{2s} + k_- \right) - \left( \underline{q}_\perp / 2 + \underline{k}_\perp \right)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

To obtain a non-zero answer by closing the  $k_+$  contour in (5.5) we must have

$$-\sqrt{2s} < k_- < 0. \tag{5.6}$$

In this case closing in the lower-half  $k_+$ -plane, picking up the pole in the last square-bracket, and making the approximation  $|k_-| \lesssim \lambda \sqrt{s}$ ,  $\lambda \ll 1$  gives

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\pi i \int d^2 \underline{k}_\perp \int_{-\lambda \sqrt{s}}^0 dk_- \left( \sqrt{2s} \right)^{-1} \left[ \underline{k}_\perp^2 + m^2 \right]^{-1} \left[ \left( \underline{q}_\perp + \underline{k}_\perp \right)^2 + m^2 \right]^{-1} \\
& \times \left[ -\sqrt{2s} k_- - \left( \underline{q}_\perp + \underline{k}_\perp \right)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

This approximation is valid for obtaining both the *leading real logarithm* which now comes from the  $k_-$  integration close to the pole (in the last bracket) and the *leading imaginary part* which comes directly from the same pole. That is

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2s}} \int_{-\lambda \sqrt{s}}^0 dk_- \left[ -\sqrt{2s} k_- - \left( \underline{q}_\perp / 2 + \underline{k}_\perp \right)^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon \right]^{-1} \tag{5.8}$$

$$\underset{s \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{2s} (\ln s - i\pi), \tag{5.9}$$

where the non-leading contribution to the real part is  $O(1/s)$  and to the imaginary part is  $O(1/s \ln s)$ . We therefore obtain

$$I(s, t, m^2) \underset{s \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} -\frac{\pi i}{2s} (\ln s - \pi i) K(t), \tag{5.10}$$

where  $K(t)$  is the *transverse momentum integral*

$$K(t) = \int d^2 k_\perp \left[ \underline{k}_\perp^2 + m^2 \right]^{-1} \left[ \left( \underline{q}_\perp + \underline{k}_\perp \right)^2 + m^2 \right]^{-1}. \tag{5.11}$$



Note that this integral can be obtained directly from (5.5) by taking

$$k_+ \sim k_- \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{s}} \Rightarrow k_+ k_- \rightarrow 0, \quad (5.12)$$

and performing the  $k_+$  and  $k_-$  integrations by putting two propagators on-shell. Indeed this is how the transverse momentum diagram emerges if we use a dispersion relation to calculate the high-energy behavior of the box-diagram. That is we first calculate the discontinuity associated with the cut shown in Fig. 5.2 using elastic unitarity. This will give the “ $\pi^2$ ” term in (5.10) with  $K(t)$  obtained directly due to the cut propagators being on-shell. The  $\ln s$  term in (5.10) is then reconstructed from the dispersion relation. In fact the use of  $s$ -channel unitarity to compute high-energy behavior is a powerful technique exploited extensively by Lipatov *et al.*[12, 14] and Bartels[19] which we shall briefly elaborate on later in this Section and in the next Section. For the moment we note only that it provides an underlying explanation for why the transverse momentum integrals obtained in the Regge limit can always be obtained from the underlying Feynman diagram(s) by putting appropriate lines on-shell.

In general we might expect the justification for using  $k_+$  and  $k_-$  integrations to produce logarithms—with the coefficients as transverse momentum integrals—to be that the integrals involved are uniformly convergent in the high-energy limit. For scalar field theories there are no numerators to add to (5.1) and indeed for such theories the transverse momentum integrals obtained are always sufficiently convergent. For the vector (gauge) theories that we shall be interested in this is not the case for individual Feynman diagrams. In fact in such theories gauge invariance produces a vast complexity of cancellations of divergent transverse momentum integrals. As we elaborate below the result is nevertheless that, after such cancellations, the only logarithms that survive are those produced by longitudinal  $k_+$  and  $k_-$  integrations “close to” on mass-shell regions. In addition, the coefficients can always be written as the corresponding transverse momentum integrals.

The reduction to transverse integrals appears to be a deep consequence of renormalizability or equivalently gauge-invariance. Alternatively, if it did not hold it is very doubtful that the theory would be describable in terms of the Regge theory we have developed in Part I. As we described in I we believe Regge behavior to be intrinsic to obtaining a unitary high-energy  $S$ -Matrix and so if a theory did not reduce (at high-energy) to the transverse momentum integrals which naturally generate Regge poles we would be very doubtful of

its self-consistency. However, as is well known from the case of massive  $QED$ [7] the emergence of transverse momentum diagrams is not in itself a guarantee of Regge behavior and high-energy unitarity.

To illustrate both the general spin structure and the general form of large transverse momentum cancellations - and also to make an additional point, we consider some low-order diagrams in an abelian gauge theory.

## 5.2 Low-Order Diagrams in QED

We consider specifically massive  $QED$ , that is both the photon and the electron are massive. Consider first the coupling  $G_1$  for a single fast electron to couple to a single photon as illustrated in Fig. 5.3. A fast electron propagator gives

$$\frac{\gamma \cdot p + m}{p^2 - m^2} \underset{p_+}{\simeq} \infty \quad \frac{\gamma_- p_+ + \not{p}_\perp + \cdots}{p^2 - m^2} \quad (5.13)$$

$$\equiv \frac{\gamma_- + \gamma_\perp \cdot (p_\perp/p_+) + 0(1/p_+^2)}{\left[ p_- - \frac{p_\perp^2 - m^2}{p_+} \right]} \quad (5.14)$$

For an electron initially and finally on-shell, we simply remove the  $(p^2 - m^2)^{-1}$  factor from (5.13) and so in lowest-order perturbation theory we obtain, before inserting external spinor factors,

$$G_{1\mu} \sim ep_+^2 \gamma_- \gamma_\mu \gamma_- \sim \gamma_- p_+^2 \quad \text{if } \gamma_\mu = \gamma_+ \quad (5.15)$$

$$= 0(|p_\perp| p_+) \quad \text{otherwise} \quad (5.16)$$

Therefore the leading power behavior (as  $p_+ \rightarrow \infty$ ) is obtained if the spin of the scattering electron is conserved, that is there is helicity conservation. Inserting external spinors allows the replacement of one  $\gamma_- p_+$  factor in (5.15) by  $m$ , giving finally

$$G_{1\mu} \sim emp_+ \delta_{\mu-} \quad (5.17)$$

To understand the spin structure of transverse-momentum diagrams that we shall exploit it will be sufficient to consider photon exchange via a simple Feynman propagator. Note first that

$$\frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{q^2 + M^2} \sim \frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{q_\perp^2 + M^2} \quad q_+ q_- \sim 0 \quad (5.18)$$

In the limit given by  $s \rightarrow \infty$  in (5.2)-(5.4), that is

$$p_{1+}, p_{2-} \longrightarrow \infty \quad p_{1-}, p_{2+} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (5.19)$$

single photon exchange gives, as illustrated in Fig. 5.3, the (helicity-conserving) amplitude for electron scattering

$$e^2 m^2 p_{1+} \delta_{+\mu} \left[ \frac{g_{\mu\nu}}{q_{\perp}^2 + M^2} \right] \delta_{\nu-} p_{2-} \quad (5.20)$$

$$\sim \frac{e^2 m^2 S}{q_{\perp}^2 + M^2} \quad (5.21)$$

The above discussion extends straightforwardly to the exchange of  $N$  photons between fast electrons. We can suppose that each intermediate state propagator is placed on-shell by  $k_-$  and  $k_+$  integrations. The denominator is thus removed from (5.14), giving in analogy with (5.15)

$$G_{N\mu_1 \dots \mu_N} \sim e^N \gamma_- \gamma_{\mu_1} \gamma_- \dots \gamma_- \gamma_{\mu_N} \gamma_- \quad (5.22)$$

$$\sim e^N \gamma_- p_+ \quad \text{if } \mu_1 = \mu_2 = \dots = \mu_N = + \quad (5.23)$$

$$= 0 \quad \text{otherwise} \quad (5.24)$$

So again the electron spin structure is preserved, and using the propagator (5.18) the Feynman diagram of Fig. 5.4 will generate the transverse-momentum diagram of Fig. 5.5, that is the helicity conserving amplitude is

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_N &= e^{2N} S \int d^2 \underline{k}_1 \dots d^2 \underline{k}_N \delta^2 (\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2 \dots - \underline{k}_N) \\ &\times \frac{1}{\underline{k}_1^2 + M^2} \dots \frac{1}{\underline{k}_N^2 + M^2} \\ &\times [\text{possible logarithms from } k_+, k_- \text{ integrations}] \end{aligned} \quad (5.25)$$

Clearly the same amplitude is given by diagrams in which the exchanged photons are emitted and absorbed by the electron lines in all possible orders. In *QED* there are no group factors involved and the symmetry (or antisymmetry) of the diagrams with respect to rotation of one electron line to be a positron line determines their signature. That is transverse momentum diagrams with an even number of photon lines appear in the even

signature amplitude, while those with an odd number appear in the odd-signature amplitude. As a result, *all* the logarithms generated by  $k_+$  or  $k_-$  integrations cancel among the diagrams and (5.25) holds without any logarithms in the bracket. As we shall discuss further shortly, this is particular to  $QED$  and is effectively the reason why the photon does not reggeize.

Moving on to the subject of large transverse-momentum cancellations, we consider now the simplest sixth-order ladder diagram illustrated in Fig. 5.6. The photons will couple to the external electrons as in (5.20) and so as the diagram is reduced to a transverse momentum integral the product of exchanged electron numerators gives[40]

$$[-\underline{k}_2 - \underline{q} + m]\gamma_-[\underline{k}_1 + \underline{k}_2 + \underline{q} + m]\gamma_+[-\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q} + m] \quad (5.26)$$

where the central bracket will reduce to a transverse-momentum factor after the  $\gamma_-$  is commuted through to the  $\gamma_+$ . Consequently the resulting high-energy behavior is

$$\begin{aligned} & -g^6 \frac{1}{2} [\ln^2 s - 2\pi i \ln s] \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k}_1}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{d^2 \underline{k}_2}{(2\pi)^3} [\underline{k}_1^2 + M^2]^{-1} [\underline{q} + \underline{k}_1 + m^2]^{-1} \\ & \times \left[ (\underline{q} + \underline{k}_2)^2 + m^2 \right]^{-1} [\underline{k}_2^2 + m^2]^{-1} [-\underline{k}_2 - \underline{q} + m] [\underline{k}_1 + \underline{k}_2 + \underline{q} + m] [-\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q} + m] \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

where  $M$  is the photon mass,  $m$  the electron mass and, as usual,  $/$  indicates multiplication by (two-dimensional) Dirac matrices.

The presence of the electron numerators in (5.27) gives a divergent integral—both the  $\underline{k}_1$  and  $\underline{k}_2$  integrations diverge. This implies that a more careful analysis of the original Feynman diagram would show that there are additional factors of  $\ln s$  that should be associated with the diagram. However, the divergences are *cancelled by other diagrams* that we will describe shortly. First we want to show that the (ladder diagram) transverse momentum diagram (5.27) actually has a *well-defined finite part* (which is ultimately the correct answer).

The numerator in (5.27) can be expanded as follows

$$\begin{aligned} & [-\underline{k}_2 - \underline{q} + m] [\underline{k}_1 + \underline{k}_2 + \underline{q} + m] [-\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q} + m] \\ & = - [\underline{k}_2 + \underline{q} - m] [\underline{q} + m] [\underline{k}_1 + \underline{q} - m] \\ & \quad + \left[ (\underline{k}_2 + \underline{q})^2 + m^2 \right] [-\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q} + m] + \left[ (\underline{k}_1 + \underline{q})^2 + m^2 \right] [-\underline{k}_2 - \underline{q} + m]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.28)$$

Each of the latter two terms vanishes when one or other electron line goes on-shell. Hence at the electron-photon threshold the last two terms can be dropped. This gives a convergent transverse momentum integral which in the even signature amplitude contributes

$$g^2 \left[ \ln^2 s + (-\ln s)^2 \right] \frac{[\alpha(\not{q}) - 1]^2}{\not{q} + m}, \quad (5.29)$$

where  $\alpha(\not{q})$  is the electron trajectory function

$$\alpha(\not{q}) = 1 + \frac{g^2}{8\pi^3} (\not{q} + m) \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k} (\not{q} - m)}{\left[ (\underline{q} + \underline{k})^2 + m^2 \right] \left[ \underline{k}^2 + M^2 \right]}. \quad (5.30)$$

That is (5.29) gives just what is required for the sixth-order contribution to the reggeization of the electron. That the t-channel threshold behavior of ladder diagrams gives the full sixth-order Regge behavior is a consequence of a general feature of renormalizable field theories containing vectors which we shall enlarge on in the discussion of dispersion relation methods in sub-Section 5.4. [It is also directly related to the success of the two-particle t-channel unitarity formalism discussed in the last Section in demonstrating the reggeization of the electron.]

Note that the transverse momentum integral (5.27) is (like that of (5.11)) obtained from the original ladder diagram of Fig. 5.6 by placing the three vertical lines on-shell. (The  $\ln s$  factors are generated “close to” this on-mass-shell configuration.) Since the relevant part of this transverse momentum integral is the  $t$ -channel threshold region where *all* of the horizontal lines of the ladder graph are then close to on-shell, this provides our first explicit illustration of a general feature we have already emphasized. That is the Regge pole behavior of a vector gauge theory originates, in first approximation, from the region of planar Feynman diagrams in which all internal lines are close to the mass-shell.

The additional diagrams needed to cancel the divergences of (5.27) are those shown in Fig. 5.7. Remarkably, perhaps, the first diagram gives a transverse momentum integral which exactly cancels the contribution to (5.27) of the second term in (5.28) while the second diagram cancels the contribution of the third term. We can see that this is an elementary example of a (generalized) Ward identity cancellation by noting that the divergence of the  $\underline{k}_2$  integration is cancelled by adding the sub-diagrams illustrated in Fig. 5.8. This amounts to attaching the photon line involved at all possible points around the electron (plus photon)

loop. The resulting softened large transverse momentum behavior is a consequence of the Ward identity involved. The corresponding Ward identities for a general spontaneously broken non-abelian gauge theory are clearly much more complicated. Nevertheless the full set of needed identities has been derived by Sen[24] in his all logarithms formalism which we referred to in the Introduction.

For several years the large transverse momentum cancellation was effectively assumed to take place by first calculating with a transverse momentum cut-off. It was then proved (or in high-order cases assumed) that within the leading  $\ln s$  approximation all logarithms of the cut-off cancel in the sum over all diagrams. In this way McCoy and Wu were able[40] to calculate, in massive QED, leading and next-to-leading logs explicitly up to twelfth order, and to generalize the results to arbitrary order. The leading logs simply describe the reggeization of the electron, and to all orders continue to be attributable to the “on mass-shell” regions of ladder diagrams. The intricacy of the “off-shell” large transverse momentum cancellations can be appreciated by noting that at twelfth-order 142 diagrams are involved[40].

Using the same “transverse-momentum cut-off” technique, Cheng and Lo[13] were able to calculate up to tenth order in  $SU(2)$  Yang-Mills theory. The leading log result is now the reggeization of the gauge bosons via “on-shell” ladder diagram contributions, confirming directly the elastic unitarity analysis described in the last Section. Since we shall explicitly utilize the Yang-Mills results in the discussion of Reggeon diagrams in the next Section we reproduce these results in some detail.

### 5.3 Transverse Momentum Diagrams for $SU(2)$ Gauge Theory

The most immediate consequence of a non-abelian symmetry is that, because of group factors, the diagrams involving the exchange of gluons no longer symmetrise and antisymmetrise according to the number of gluons as in  $QED$ . This implies that the factors of  $\ln s$  allowed for in (5.25) do not cancel. This, combined with the existence of gluon interaction vertices, results in many different diagrams contributing to leading-order calculations, with (at first sight) no distinctive topology involved.

For an  $SU(2)$  Yang-Mills theory with the gluons given a mass by the Higgs mechanism (involving one *fundamental representation*  $SU(2)$  doublet of scalar fields), Cheng and Lo have derived leading and non-leading log results up to tenth order[13]. There is an  $SU(2)$  global symmetry of the theory and the results depend on the  $t$ -channel “isospin” of amplitudes

under this symmetry. We can summarize the Cheng and Lo results for (massive) gluon-gluon scattering as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
T_0 \sim & isg^4 \left\{ J_1(q) + \left[ 2J_2(q) - 2 \left( q^2 + \frac{5}{4}M^2 \right) J_1(q^2) \right] g^2 \ln s \right. \\
& + \left[ J_3(q) + \tilde{J}(q) - 4 \left( q^2 + \frac{5}{4}M^2 \right) J_1(q)J_2(q) \right. \\
& + 2 \left( q^2 + \frac{5}{4}M^2 \right)^2 J_1^3(q) \left. \right] (g^2 \ln s)^2 + \left[ \frac{2}{3}J_4(q) - \frac{1}{3}J_A(q) \right. \\
& - J_B(q) + \frac{4}{3}J_C(q) + \frac{2}{3}J_D(q) - \frac{4}{3} \left( q^2 + \frac{5}{4}M^2 \right) (J_2^2(q) + \\
& J_1(q)J_3(q) + J_1(q)\tilde{J}(q)) + 4 \left( q^2 + \frac{5}{4}M^2 \right)^2 J_1^2(q)J_2(q) \\
& \left. - \frac{4}{3} \left( q^2 + \frac{5}{4}M^2 \right)^3 J_1^4(q) \right] (g^2 \ln s)^3 + \dots \left. \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.31}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_1 \sim & \frac{sg^2}{q^2 + M^2} \left\{ 1 - (q^2 + M^2) J_1(q)g^2 \ln s + \frac{1}{2} [(q^2 + M^2) J_1(q)g^2 \ln s]^2 \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{1}{6} [(q^2 + M^2) J_1(q)g^2 \ln s]^3 + \frac{1}{24} [(q^2 + M^2) J_1(q)g^2 \ln s]^4 + \dots \right\}
\end{aligned} \tag{5.32}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
T_2 \sim & isg^4 \left\{ J_1(q) + [-4J_2(q) + (q^2 + 2M^2) J_1^2(q)] g^2 \ln s \right. \\
& + [4J_3(q) + 4\tilde{J}(q) - 4(q^2 + 2M^2) J_1(q)J_2(q) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} (q^2 + 2M^2)^2 J_1^3(q)] (g^2 \ln s)^2 + \left[ -\frac{4}{3}J_4(q) - \frac{4}{3}J_4(q) - \frac{4}{3}J_A(q) \right. \\
& - 4J_B(q) - \frac{8}{3}J_C(q) - \frac{4}{3}J_D(q) - \frac{8}{3} (q^2 + 2M^2) (J_2^2(q) \\
& + J_1(q)J_3(q) + J_1(q)\tilde{J}(q)) - 2 (q^2 + 2M^2)^2 J_1^2(q)J_2(q) \\
& \left. + \frac{1}{6} (q^2 + 2M^2)^3 J_1^4(q) \right] (g^2 \ln s)^3 + \dots \left. \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.33}$$

$J_1(q)$ ,  $J_2(q)$ ,  $J_3(q)$ ,  $\tilde{J}(q)$ ,  $J_A(q)$ ,  $J_B(q)$ ,  $J_C(q)$  and  $J_D(q)$ , are all transverse momentum integrals with the diagrammatic representation shown in Fig. 4.9 and having the following

explicit form

$$J_1(q) = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^3} [k^2 + M^2]^{-1} [(q-k)^2 + M^2]^{-1} \equiv \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} K(q^2) \quad (5.34)$$

$$J_n(q) = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{J_{n-1}(k)}{[(q-k)^2 + M^2]} \quad n = 2, 3 \quad (5.35)$$

$$\tilde{J}(q) = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{(k^2 + q^2) J_1^2(k)}{[(q-k)^2 + M^2]} \quad (5.36)$$

$$J_A(q) = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{(k^2 + M^2)^2 J_1^3(k)}{(q-k)^2 + M^2} \quad (5.37)$$

$$J_B(q) = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^3} (k^2 + M^2)^2 J_1^2(k) J_1(q-k) \quad (5.38)$$

$$J_C(q) = \int \frac{d^2k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{(k^2 + M^2)^2 J_1(k) J_2(k)}{(q-k)^2 + M^2} \quad (5.39)$$

$$J_D(q) = \int \frac{d^2k_1 d^2k_2 (k_1^2 + M^2) J_1(k_1) (k_2^2 + M^2) J_1(k_2)}{(2\pi)^6 [(q-k_1)^2 + M^2] [(q-k_2)^2 + M^2] [(q-k_1-k_2)^2 + M^2]}. \quad (5.40)$$

The complexity of these results is a testimony to the enormous effort involved in performing the underlying Feynman diagram calculations. (Several hundred diagrams contribute at tenth order.) The most striking feature is the simple form of the  $T_1$  amplitude which, as we noted above, contains only the reggeization of the gluon. That is (5.32) is clearly an expansion of the Regge pole amplitude

$$T_1 = \frac{g^2 s^{\alpha(t)}}{q^2 + M^2}, \quad \alpha(t) = 1 + g^2 J_1(q) \quad (5.41)$$

The first  $\ln s$  term in the expansion comes directly from box diagrams as in (5.10). The crossed and uncrossed diagrams do not cancel in the odd-signature amplitude, as in  $QED$ , but instead give just the right factor for (5.41). This is what the t-channel unitarity analysis of the last Section anticipates. That analysis also anticipates that *only two-particle t-channel states are important in the leading-log result to all orders*. This is indeed the case, and can be demonstrated by showing, in analogy with our discussion of the reggeization of the electron in massive  $QED$ , that (5.32) is correctly reproduced by keeping only the leading *two-particle threshold* “finite part” of ladder diagram transverse momentum integrals. That is *the leading-log reggeization of the gluon comes directly from the (close to) on mass-shell regions of ladder*



*diagrams, with the remaining hundreds of diagrams involved simply producing (at the leading-log level) an extremely elaborate set of cancellations.* We should note that the absence at leading-log level of higher-order ladder diagram contributions involving more than two states in the t-channel (where some lines are necessarily off-shell) is, in part, due to a cancellation that does not involve divergences. This is an important feature which is not adequately illustrated by our discussion of *QED* diagrams. It ultimately includes contributions from general planar diagrams and will be part of the “Multi-Regge Bootstrap” described in the next Section. We shall give a more detailed discussion of this cancellation in the next sub-Section.

We might have expected general planar diagrams with all lines close to mass-shell to also contribute to the leading-log result. This would presumably be the case if we were considering the generation of bound-state Regge poles. However, as we emphasized in the last Section, a complicated (infinite) spectrum of trajectories would then also be anticipated. In the special case of the reggeization of an elementary gluon that we are discussing the simplification that only two-particle states in the t-channel are involved at the leading-log level is very important and is what allows the complete set of all (leading-power) logarithms to be described by the exchange of an isolated Regge pole and its associated Regge cuts (as we describe in the following). We have emphasized the importance of this for ultimately arriving at an isolated Pomeron pole describing hadron interactions.

The non-leading log results for  $T_0$  and  $T_2$  are clearly more complicated, even though they also involve very complex cancellations. In the next Section we shall address the problem of reducing the results for  $T_0$  and  $T_2$  to a simplicity corresponding to that of  $T_1$ . This is, in fact, what will be achieved by the introduction of *reggeon diagrams*. In the rest of this Section we shall describe an alternative formalism and further results which both strengthen and extend the above results and also provide insight into their origin.

We consider now the dispersion relation, s-channel unitarity, calculational method utilized by Lipatov and collaborators[12, 14] and extensively developed by Bartels[19]. This method is particularly powerful when applied to vector theories because vector exchange is, as is very well known, very close to violating unitarity bounds. As a result unitarity (and renormalizability) strongly constrain the general form of amplitudes and can be exploited very effectively, at high energy, in reducing the complications of the perturbation expansion for non-abelian gauge theories.

## 5.4 Renormalizability and Dispersive Calculations of Vector Gauge Theories

Consider first the calculation of the high-energy Regge behavior of the *set of tree diagrams* for gluon-gluon scattering in a non-abelian theory. It is well-known, of course, that  $t$ -channel exchange of a vector gives an amplitude proportional to  $s$ . However, there are actually several diagrams giving comparable behavior. They are illustrated in Fig. 5.10. Each diagram gives a result of the form

$$A(s, t) \underset{s \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} s f(t). \quad (5.42)$$

Now renormalizability (or equivalently the unitarity bound) implies that the *sum of all diagrams* grows no faster than  $|t|^{1/2}$  in the limit  $s \sim t \rightarrow \infty$ . Therefore since we are considering only a finite number of diagrams, there can be no non-uniformities in the limits involved, and for the sum of all diagrams in Fig. 5.10 we must have

$$f(t) \underset{t \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} |t|^{-1/2}. \quad (5.43)$$

This implies that  $f(t)$  satisfies an unsubtracted dispersion relation

$$f(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int \frac{dt'}{(t' - t)} \text{Im } f(t'). \quad (5.44)$$

But the only diagram in Fig. 5.10 with a singularity in the  $t$ -channel is the pole term. Therefore we can construct  $f(t)$  from the dispersion relation and use the single diagram only. We can then infer that the *sum of diagrams* gives a non-zero result *only if* the  $t$ -channel quantum numbers allow exchange of a vector meson, and that in this case

$$M_{ab \rightarrow cd}(s, t) \sim \gamma_{ac} \gamma_{bd} \frac{s}{(t - M^2)} \quad (5.45)$$

where the residues  $\gamma_{ac}$  and  $\gamma_{bd}$  are the “on-shell” couplings evaluated at  $t = M^2$ . The complicated problem of evaluating and summing the diagrams in Fig. 5.10 is therefore completely by-passed by a simple exploitation of unitarity and analyticity!

The real power of the above argument is apparent when it is applied in the multi-Regge limit, as we briefly illustrate in the following. (A final description of the results has to await the multi-Regge Bootstrap described in the next Section.) Using the kinematics illustrated in Fig. 5.11, the multi-Regge limit can be specified by writing

$$q_i = \beta_i P_b - \alpha_i P_a + q_{i\perp} \quad (5.46)$$

fixing  $q_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, n+1$ , and requiring

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &\gg \alpha_1 \gg \alpha_2 \cdots \gg \alpha_{n+1} \sim M^2/s \\ 1 &\gg \beta_{n+1} \gg \beta_n \gg \cdots \beta_1 \sim M^2/s \end{aligned} \quad (5.47)$$

The diagram cancellation argument above can be generalized to show that

$$M_{ab \rightarrow cd+n} \sim s \gamma_{ab} \frac{1}{(q_1^2 + M^2)} \gamma_1 \frac{1}{(q_2^2 + M^2)} \gamma_2 \cdots \gamma_n \frac{1}{(q_{n+1}^2 + M^2)} \gamma_{bc} \quad (5.48)$$

where the (complicated) residue functions  $\gamma_i = \gamma_i(q_i, q_{i+1})$  are determined uniquely by the spin properties of the produced particles together with unsubtracted dispersion relations in the momentum transfer variables (exploiting the renormalizability/unitarity boundedness properties of on-shell Born amplitudes).

The technique of Lipatov et al.[12, 14] is to combine (5.48) with an approximation to  $n+2$  - body phase-space in the region (5.47) *i.e.*

$$d\rho_{n+2} \sim \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3n+2} 2^{n+1} s} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{d\alpha_i}{\alpha_i} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} d^2 \underline{q}_{j\perp} \quad (5.49)$$

Integration over the  $\alpha_i$  in the region (5.47) then gives

$$d\rho_{n+2} \longrightarrow \ln^n(s/M^2) \frac{1}{(2\pi)^{3n+2} 2^{n+1} s} \frac{1}{n!} \prod_{j=1}^{n+1} d^2 \underline{q}_{j\perp} \quad (5.50)$$

and so the unitarity equation gives

$$M_{ab \rightarrow cd}(s, q^2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int d\rho_{n+2} M_{ab \rightarrow n+2} M_{cd \rightarrow n+2}^* \quad (5.51)$$

with  $M_{ab \rightarrow cd}$  satisfying a twice subtracted dispersion relation

$$\begin{aligned} M = \frac{s^2}{2\pi i} \int \frac{ds'}{(s' - s)(s')^2} \quad di_s c M + \frac{u^2}{2\pi i} \int \frac{du'}{(u' - u)(u')^2} \quad di_u c M \\ + C_1 s + C_2 \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

where  $u$  is the usual invariant variable and  $C_1$  and  $C_2$  are subtraction constants. The logarithms produced by (5.50) dominate the subtraction terms in (5.52) and hence inserting

(5.50) into (5.51) and performing the  $s$  and  $u$  integrations in (5.52) amounts to the replacement

$$s \ln^n (s/M^2) \rightarrow - \left[ s \ln^{n+1} (-s/M^2) \pm (-s) \ln^{n+1} (s/M^2) \right] \left[ 2\pi(n+1) \right]^{-1} \quad (5.53)$$

with the plus sign for positive signature (t-channel  $I=0,2$ ) and the minus sign for negative signature ( $I=1$ ).

Clearly integrating (5.48) over the phase-space (5.50) will give a product of transverse momentum integrals as the coefficient multiplying (5.53). That the integrals are convergent follows directly from the fall-off properties of the  $\gamma_i$  discussed above. Indeed from this perspective, the large transverse momentum cancellations found in the Feynman gauge calculations of Cheng and Lo are simply a manifestation of renormalizability, or (presumably) equivalent unitarity, bounds for on-shell production amplitudes.

Conversely, once we know that all transverse momentum integrals are convergent, then the *leading-log results can only come from vector-exchange in the multi-regge regions of phase-space* and it immediately follows from (5.53) that the leading real logarithms will be in the odd-signature channel. However, within the unitarity construction we are outlining there is a vital additional cancellation which goes beyond the finiteness of transverse momentum integrals and is responsible for the extreme simplicity of the odd-signature  $T_1$  amplitude. This is what we referred to earlier as the cancellation of the finite regions of ladder diagrams with more than two states in the t-channel. We can illustrate this cancellation at the two-loop level, where it first appears, and where it can be described without reference to the multi-Regge bootstrap.

The multi-Regge region for three-particle (s-channel) intermediate states contributes two transverse momentum integrals. The first is the product of bubbles illustrated in Fig. 5.12(a) while the second originates from central-region vector production and is illustrated in Fig. 5.12(b). In *QED* the ladder diagram of Fig. 5.6 generates the second diagram only at the next-to-leading log level, whereas in a non-abelian theory it appears at the leading log-level. However, as illustrated in Fig. 5.13, s-channel iteration of the two-particle (s-channel) state produces the same diagram (in a non-abelian theory) and at the leading log-level, that is in the  $T_1$  amplitude, these distinct unitarity contributions cancel. As a result the  $T_1$  amplitude contains only Fig. 5.12(a), at the two-loop-level, and so contains *only two-particle states in the t-channel*. As we elaborate further in the next Section, a gen-

eralization of this cancellation result persists to all orders as the Multi-Regge Bootstrap, and explains why the two-particle unitarity analysis of the last Section correctly demonstrates the reggeization of non-abelian gauge bosons. It also confirms that (in the  $t$ -channel) the reggeization can be understood as originating from that region of ladder diagrams where *all* internal lines are close to on mass-shell.

Note also that the close relationship between Regge singularities and the corresponding  $t$ -channel thresholds, which the general analysis of Part I is based on, is clearly beginning to emerge. *Isolated* Regge pole behavior is associated with two-particle unitarity while, as we shall shortly demonstrate, the higher thresholds produce Regge cuts (and modify the trajectory functions of Regge poles) but *do not* produce any *new* Regge Poles . The importance of this is that we can then expect *multiparticle  $t$ -channel unitarity to be completely represented by the reggeon unitarity of the reggeon diagrams we introduce.*

In general terms it is clear that the dominance and simplicity of the mass-shell regions in a non-abelian gauge theory is just what we expect the dispersion-relation based Regge theory of Part I will be able to exploit. The “short-distance” off mass-shell region, which would surely require field theoretic techniques to analyse, cancels out entirely. That the off-shell large transverse momentum cancellations do indeed take place *at all orders of logarithms* is a major consequence of the work of Sen[24]. The techniques used by Sen involve a powerful exploitation of the relationship between gauge invariance and Lorentz invariance and straightforwardly give, for example, the fourth order term in the electron trajectory function. However, although we believe these techniques may be exploited further in the future we will not describe them here since their major significance for our program (at this point) is simply to guarantee that we can safely neglect that part of the theory which is not controlled by “Analytic Multi-Regge Theory”.

## 6. REGGEON DIAGRAMS

We begin this Section by rewriting (5.31)–(5.40) in terms of reggeon diagrams following the work of Bronzan and Sugar[41]. This will produce what is, at first sight, a remarkable simplification of the results for  $T_0$  and  $T_2$ . We shall then describe the results of Fadin, Kuraev and Lipatov[12] which extend (5.46)–(5.53) to a “multi-regge bootstrap” and in doing so, explain why this simplification has to occur.

It is interesting, and perhaps not too surprising, that initially several authors were tempted by the low-order results for  $T_0$  to introduce a vacuum Regge pole with the trajectory

$$\alpha^\circ(\underline{q}^2) = 1 - 2g^2 \left( \underline{q}^2 + \frac{5}{4}M^2 \right) J_1(\underline{q}^2) \quad (6.1)$$

Fortunately this is not only an unnecessary complication but is also demonstrably wrong, as we shall shortly elucidate. Both  $T_0$  and  $T_2$  are completely described by reggeon diagrams which give a two-reggeon cut as the *only* Regge singularity in these amplitudes.

### 6.1 SU(2) Leading and Next-to-Leading Log Diagrams

We write odd-signature reggeon diagrams in the same notation that we used for Pomeron reggeon diagrams in Section 6 of I, that is we use  $E$  and  $\underline{k}$  as variables. For an odd-signature reggeized vector we must, as in Section 7 of I, include the particle pole in the reggeon propagator. Therefore we write

$$\Gamma_{1,1}(\underline{E}_1, \underline{k}^2) = \frac{1}{[E - \Delta(\underline{k}^2)]} \frac{1}{[\underline{k}^2 + M^2]}, \quad (6.2)$$

where now

$$\Delta(\underline{k}^2) = 1 - \alpha(\underline{k}^2) \quad (6.3)$$

$$= g^2(k^2 + M^2)J_1(k^2). \quad (6.4)$$

The two-reggeon diagram illustrated in Fig. 6.1 is written in  $E$ -space as

$$F_2^I(E, \underline{q}^2) = \int \frac{dE_1 d^2 \underline{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{[\beta_2^I]^2}{[E_1 - \Delta(\underline{k}^2)] [\underline{k}^2 + M^2] [E - E_1 - \Delta((\underline{q} - \underline{k})^2)] [(\underline{k} - \underline{q})^2 + M^2]} \quad (6.5)$$

where  $\beta_2^I$  is the coupling of two-reggeons, with t-channel isospin I, to the external particles. (In general this coupling can be a function of both  $\underline{q}$  and  $\underline{k}$  although in the leading-log order to which we work this dependence will be absent). Performing the  $E_1$ -integration and writing the (even-signature) S-W transform gives

$$F_2^I(s, \underline{q}^2) = is \int \frac{dE}{2\pi i} s^{-E} \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k}}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{[\beta_2^I]^2}{[E - \Delta(\underline{k}^2) - \Delta((\underline{q} - \underline{k})^2)] [\underline{k}^2 + M^2] [(\underline{k} - \underline{q})^2 + M^2]} \quad (6.6)$$

Now using the expansion

$$\int \frac{dE}{2\pi i} \frac{s^{-E}}{[E - A]} = 1 - A \ln s + \frac{1}{2!} (A \ln s)^2 + \dots \quad (6.7)$$

we can expand the denominator of (6.6) and, if we simply take  $\beta_2^I = g^2$ , we obtain

$$F_2^I(s, q^2) = is g^4 \left\{ J_1(q^2) - 2J_2(q^2)g^2 \ln s + [J_3(\underline{q}^2) + \tilde{J}(\underline{q}^2)] (g^2 \ln s)^2 - \left[ \frac{1}{3} J_A(\underline{q}^2) + J_B(\underline{q}^2) \right] (g^2 \ln s)^3 + \dots \right\} \quad (6.8)$$

This gives the first term in the expansions for  $T_0$  and  $T_2$  exactly, with higher-order terms also partially reproduced.

Proceeding in the same fashion, Bronzan and Sugar[41] were able to show that the *complete* 10th order results for  $T_0$  and  $T_2$  are exactly produced by adding the four reggeon diagrams shown in Fig. 6.2 if we introduce the four-reggeon interaction

$$R_{2,2}^I(q, \underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2) = a_I q^2 + b_I M^2 + c_I V(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q}), \quad (6.9)$$

where the notation is illustrated in Fig. 6.3.  $V$  is universal and has the complicated structure

$$V(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q}) = \frac{(\underline{k}_1^2 + M^2) ((\underline{q} - \underline{k}_2)^2 + M^2) + (\underline{k}_2^2 + M^2) ((\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1)^2 + M^2)}{(\underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2)^2 + M^2} + \frac{(\underline{k}_1^2 + M^2) (\underline{k}_2^2 + M^2) + ((\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1) + M^2) ((\underline{q} - \underline{k}_2)^2 + M^2)}{(\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2)^2 + M^2}. \quad (6.10)$$

For both I=0 and I=2 we have

$$a_I = C_I g^2, \quad b_I = \frac{3C_I - 1}{2} g^2, \quad c_I = -\frac{C_I}{2} g^2 \quad \text{with } C_I = 2 - \frac{I(I+1)}{2} \quad (6.11)$$

Note that all of the parameters of (6.10) are completely determined by the expansions up to sixth order only. Therefore the third and fourth reggeon diagrams shown in Fig. 6.2 are *explicit predictions* of the eighth and tenth order contributions respectively. Consequently it is clear that in addition to extrapolating the reggeization of  $T_1$  to be the leading log result to all orders, we can also extrapolate the reggeon diagram series illustrated in Fig. 6.2 to give  $T_0$  and  $T_2$  to all orders as the next-to-leading log result. This is the desired simplification of the results for  $T_0$  and  $T_2$ .

Bronzan and Sugar also allowed for the addition of further Regge poles such as (6.1) together with the corresponding reggeon diagrams. They found that *all* such contributions *completely decoupled* in their final expressions.

## 6.2 The Multi-Regge Bootstrap

A fundamental explanation of the simplicity of the above results is found in the following extension of the s-channel unitarity calculations outlined in Subsection 5.4. If it is assumed that the basic argument for the convergence of transverse momentum integrals extends appropriately then the leading log result for *all production amplitudes in the multi-regge limit* will be given by the exchange of *reggeized* vector bosons. Fadin, Kuraev and Lipatov[12] checked that this was the case for some low-order production amplitudes and then assumed that in the general multi-regge leading log approximation, (5.47) becomes

$$M_{ab \rightarrow cd+n} \sim \gamma_{ab} \left( \frac{s_1}{M^2} \right)^{\Delta(\underline{q}_1^2)} \frac{\gamma_1}{(\underline{q}_1^2 + M^2)} \left( \frac{s_2}{M^2} \right)^{\Delta(\underline{q}_2^2)} \frac{\gamma_2}{(\underline{q}_2^2 + M^2)} \cdots \frac{\gamma_n}{(\underline{q}_n^2 + M^2)} \left( \frac{s_{n+1}}{M^2} \right)^{\Delta(\underline{q}_{n+1}^2)} \gamma_{bc} \quad (6.12)$$

where  $\Delta(\underline{q}^2)$  is again defined by (6.3) and (6.4). The  $\gamma_i$  actually have a complicated form which is important for the consistency of (6.12) with the general form of multi-regge amplitudes given in Part I. However, we shall not dwell on this point here. The vital result we want to emphasize is that when (6.12) is inserted into the unitarity equation (5.51), as illustrated in Fig. 6.4, and (5.52) is used *the complete set of leading and non-leading results* (5.31)–(5.33) is reproduced.

There are several comments to be made. First we note that the cancellation of Fig. 5.12(b) by Fig. 5.13 is completely accounted for by the reggeization of the exchanged vector mesons. That is once reggeization is included then, at the leading-log level, we only



need consider the “multiperipheral” production processes illustrated in Fig. 6.4 . Secondly we note that such production processes can only possibly produce the reggeon diagrams found by Bronzan and Sugar. Consequently the “remarkable” simplification that we described above is simply *a consequence of the leading log reggeization of production processes*.

The complete set of leading and next-to-leading log results extrapolated to all orders can be compactly summarized by one integral equation. The on-shell gluon-gluon scattering amplitudes  $T_0, T_1, T_2$  are given by

$$T_I(E, \underline{q}^2) = T_2^I(E, \underline{q}, \underline{k})_{\underline{k}^2 = (\underline{q} - \underline{k})^2 = M^2} \quad (6.13)$$

where the  $T_2^I$  are “off-shell” gluon-reggeon scattering amplitudes (see Fig. 6.5 for notation) which satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} \left[ E - \Delta(\underline{k}^2) - \Delta((\underline{k} - \underline{q})^2) \right] T_2^I(E, \underline{k}, \underline{q}) &= \frac{E}{a_I \underline{q}^2 + b_I M^2} + \\ &\frac{g^2}{2\pi} \int \frac{d^2 k' R_{2,2}^I(\underline{q}, \underline{k}, \underline{k}') T_2^I(E, \underline{k}', \underline{q})}{[\underline{k}'^2 + M^2] \left[ (\underline{q} - \underline{k}')^2 + M^2 \right]} \end{aligned} \quad (6.14)$$

where  $R_{2,2}^I$  is defined by (6.9)–(6.11), *also for*  $I = 1$ . (Note that since  $T_0$  and  $T_2$  are even-signature amplitudes the zero-order contribution of the inhomogeneous term in (6.14) is essentially irrelevant). For  $I = 0$ , (6.14) is the massive version of the “Lipatov equation” which has been the focus of attention in general discussions of “small-x physics” and the “perturbative Pomeron”.

The simple reggeization of  $T_1$  is now restated by noting that, for  $I = 1$ , (6.14) has the *exact* solution

$$T_2^1(E, \underline{k}, \underline{q}) = \frac{E}{(\underline{q}^2 + M^2)(E - \Delta(\underline{q}^2))} \quad (6.15)$$

Given that it is multiperipheral production which leads to (6.14) we can aptly describe this solution as a “multiperipheral bootstrap” of the kind that was suggested historically for the Pomeron. It is clearly very tempting to believe that an ultimate understanding of the Pomeron in QCD should in some way or other carry over the simple bootstrap properties of the gluon to the Pomeron. For the present we shall (later in this Section) simply exploit the bootstrap to show how the reggeized gluon diagrams can be directly generated from reggeon unitarity in a manner very similar to the derivation of Pomeron RFT in Section 6 of Part I.

### 6.3 Multi-Regge Behavior and the Transverse Momentum Cut-Off

We emphasized in the previous Section that the transverse momentum diagrams derived in leading and next-to-leading log approximations are actually obtained by first imposing a transverse momentum cut-off within individual Feynman integrals. In general it is found that a finite limit is obtained if this cut-off is removed after the high-energy limit is taken and after the sum over all diagrams (of the appropriate order) is performed. Of course, just because a limit exists it is not necessarily correct to take it. Indeed we shall discuss in the next Section some general issues of principle which determine that if we want to reach the high-energy behavior of an unbroken gauge theory, it is imperative that the cut-off not be removed until after the infra-red limit of massless gluons is taken.

At this point we want to note a simple, practical, reason why a transverse momentum cut-off should be employed in the multiperipheral calculation which inserts (6.12) into (5.50) (even though this may lead to violations of the bootstrap equation, for example, that vanish only as the cut-off is removed). We are inserting multi-regge behavior with the trajectory given, in first approximation, by (6.4). This trajectory function has the qualitative shape illustrated in Fig. 6.6, where the units on the horizontal axis are multiples of  $M^2$  and on the vertical axis are multiples of  $(g^2/16\pi^2)$ . For finite  $M^2$  and small  $g^2$  it is clearly necessary to go to large  $q^2$  before the trajectory decreases by a single unit in the angular momentum plane. Therefore the production amplitudes we begin with are good leading-power approximations (apart from the Regge cut behavior that is generated by the higher order reggeon diagrams that we construct) out to reasonably large, *but not infinitely large*, transverse momentum. However, as  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$  the trajectory function goes to  $-\infty$ , *except at  $q^2 = 0$* . Consequently, *in this limit*, our initial multi-Regge amplitude is not even a leading power approximation at finite transverse momentum. The trajectory of the two-reggeon cut is also shown in Fig. 6.6 and when this is incorporated it clearly extends the leading power approximation out to larger  $q^2$ . Nevertheless, in the massless limit, the complete set of reggeon diagrams that we construct can at best describe the full amplitude only at transverse momenta very close to zero - *certainly not at infinite transverse momenta*. Hence, in our opinion, the transverse cut-off is mandatory.

### 6.4 General Structure of the Reggeon Diagrams

From the point of view of the general multi-regge theory of Part I it is clear that

the existing perturbative calculations have exposed only an extremely small subset of the full reggeon structure which from the general arguments must be present. We would, of course, like to use the general formalism to reliably extrapolate the perturbative results to the complete structure, particularly the multiparticle amplitudes which we shall need in the following Sections. In the first instance at least, we shall not need as much detail as appears in the weak-coupling perturbative calculations. Instead we would be satisfied with a formalism where the general features are sufficiently under control for us to discuss reliably the infra-red and critical limits that will concern us, in a manner comparable with the “critical phenomenon” treatment of the Critical Pomeron discussed in Part I. As we elaborated, the Critical Pomeron formalism has the very attractive feature that we need to know only the existence of an even signature Regge pole with intercept  $\alpha(0)$  near one and a finite non-zero triple Pomeron interaction. We can then justify the neglect of *non-singular* higher-order interactions and (in effect) use the reggeon unitarity relations alone to predict the dominant scaling behavior of the diffraction peak in the limit  $\alpha(0) \rightarrow 1$ .

In analogy with the Pomeron formalism, therefore, we are immediately led to ask how much of the structure found in the perturbative Yang-Mills calculations can we reproduce from the general formalism if we suppose we know only the existence of odd-signature reggeons, with a particular group structure, together with low-order *non-singular* interactions. At first sight the answer is very little indeed, since we apparently would not anticipate the four-reggeon vertex (6.10). This vertex looks very complicated and also is singular as a function of its transverse momenta. Clearly we can expect further non-leading logarithms to generate arbitrarily high-order reggeon interactions in all possible isospin channels with comparably singular transverse momentum structure. This has immediate consequences.

If we were to try to apply the renormalization group, as we did for the Pomeron RFT in Section 6 of I, to look for possible critical behavior of the full reggeized gluon RFT, we would find a very important difference. For the Pomeron RFT we found that all but the lowest-order vertices had negative scaling dimensions and so were irrelevant at the fixed-point we found. Assuming that the transverse momentum singularity structure described above generalizes, then all reggeized gluon vertices will have the *same scaling dimension*. Consequently a fixed-point, if it existed, would involve all vertices, making the finding of such a feature, given only the structure of the lowest order vertices, almost impossible. The transverse momentum singularities are due to the vector particle on the gluon trajectory and it seems that to successfully apply the renormalization group we need some form of RFT

without such singularities. This clearly suggests that we must understand confinement and uncover the Pomeron before we can apply the RFT renormalization group.

On a much less ambitious level the complicated form of the four reggeon vertex apparently makes it difficult to extrapolate to even the general structure of the high-order vertices without performing the corresponding calculations. If this were the case then the initial success of the general formalism - that at 10th order hundreds of Feynman diagrams are completely summarized by just five reggeon diagrams - would be essentially worthless. That is, the ultimate goal of completely summarizing the high-energy behavior of spontaneously broken gauge theories in terms of reggeon diagrams would clearly be hopeless.

Fortunately there is a further vital simplification to be observed. We shall be able to argue in the following that the singularity of the interaction, and even the singularity of the trajectory function (6.4), is an effect of formulating reggeon diagrams with only those interactions that satisfy *signature conservation* rules. In particular, the signature of the two-reggeon cut generated by two reggeized gluons is necessarily even, while the gluon itself, of course, has negative signature. Therefore if signature is conserved (as it is in the reggeon diagrams of four-particle amplitudes) we should not have diagrams in which a three-reggeon vertex directly couples a reggeized gluon to a two-reggeon cut. In terms of general multi-regge theory, a three reggeized gluon vertex is certainly possible and we would expect such a vertex to make major contributions to multi-regge amplitudes.

If a three-reggeon vertex exists then signature conservation should be implemented in the reggeon diagrams of four-particle amplitudes by the presence of a “nonsense-zero” of the form (in the notation of Fig. 6.7)

$$\Gamma_{12}(E, \underline{k}, \underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2) \sim [E - \Delta(k_1) - \Delta(k_2)] r_{12} \quad (6.16)$$

$$_{E \sim \Delta(k)} \sim [\Delta(k) - \Delta(k_1) - \Delta(k_2)] r_{12}. \quad (6.17)$$

Indeed it follows from (6.14) and (6.15) that  $T_{2,2}^I$  is defined so that in lowest order it contains a *nonsense-pole* factor of the form of (6.16). Consequently if the full three-reggeon vertex is defined from the residue of the Regge pole in (6.14), with the nonsense-pole factor extracted, it will indeed have the form (6.16).

Given the existence of the nonsense zero, it is natural to consider whether the complicated four-reggeon vertex might actually originate from a product of three-reggeon vertices (containing such zeroes) and a reggeon propagator. Indeed the purpose of the next sub-

Section will be to show that given only the existence of the nonsense zero in the triple reggeon vertex and the ‘multiperipheral’ origin of the reggeized gluon, we can essentially reconstruct all of the general structure of the reggeon diagrams from t-channel unitarity and the hexagraph formalism. We shall, however, have to develop a rather elaborate construction procedure.

## 6.5 Reggeon Diagrams from Hexagraph Loops

The essential difference between the reggeon unitarity equation for odd-signature reggeons and that for even signature Pomerons is that the signature factor behavior I.(6.3) will be replaced by

$$\sin \frac{\pi}{2}(\alpha_1 - \tau'_1) \sim \frac{\pi}{2}\Delta(t_1), \quad \dots, \quad \sin \frac{\pi}{2}(\alpha_N - \tau'_N) \sim \frac{\pi}{2}\Delta(t_N)$$

$$t_1 \sim \dots \sim t_N \sim M^2 \sim 0 \quad (6.18)$$

We noted above that the propagator for an odd-signature reggeon contains a signature factor (particle pole) - that is unless a discontinuity is taken through the reggeon as we discuss below. In general the effective propagator for an N-reggeon intermediate state in a hexagraph loop diagram contains signature factors for each ‘new’ reggeon which appears (supposing for the moment that we construct the diagram by proceeding from left to right across the rapidity axis) in addition to the nonsense pole “energy denominator”. That is we write for such a propagator

$$\left[ E - \Delta(\underline{k}_1^2) - \dots \Delta(\underline{k}_N^2) \right]^{-1} \left[ \Delta(\underline{k}_r^2) \dots \Delta(\underline{k}_{r+s}^2) \right]^{-1} \quad (6.19)$$

where  $r, \dots, r+s$  are the new reggeon lines and, as yet, the trajectory function  $\Delta(k^2)$  can have a general functional form. The signature factors are an immediate source of transverse momentum singularities and the issue we have to resolve is whether they can actually produce all the singularities of gluon reggeon diagrams via a systematic construction procedure.

Consider now the transverse momentum loop contribution (6.4) to the trajectory function. We would like to understand this as originating from the simplest hexagraph loop, that is the diagram shown in Fig. 6.8. At first sight there are two nonsense-zeroes of the form (6.16) from the two triple reggeon vertices, just one of which is sufficient to cancel the reggeon propagator from the intermediate two-reggeon state. Therefore we might easily conclude that this diagram has essentially no meaning. However, if we consider the

‘multiperipheral’ cut through the diagram, as illustrated, then for any finite upper limit on the mass of the states contributing to the cut reggeons the diagram should make sense as a two-reggeon loop amplitude. This is because the nonsense zero of (6.15) appears only after the infinite sum over states is performed - and the integral equation (6.14) is satisfied. Consequently the diagram should make sense if it is first evaluated as a reggeon loop with general vertices as illustrated in Fig. 6.9 which are then replaced by a regge pole plus nonsense zero vertex as illustrated - to represent the limit of an infinite sum over states.

Note that we can also represent the ( $I = 1$ ) sum of multiperipheral diagrams generating the gluon reggeon via the integral equation (6.14) as in Fig. 6.10, where the bubbles are first defined to include only a finite number of intermediate states. Taking the limit of an infinite number of states then implies that we can replace the bubbles by a Regge pole with nonsense zero vertices. This gives the series of diagrams shown in Fig. 6.11, with the single loop diagram being that of Fig. 6.8.

Cutting a reggeon simply means that a discontinuity is taken - which has the effect of removing the particle-pole signature factors for the cut reggeons. Therefore if we evaluate the diagram of Fig. 6.8 with one nonsense-zero cancelling the two-reggeon propagator and write the other in the form (6.17) we obtain

$$\left[ \frac{1}{E - \Delta(\underline{q})} \right]^2 r_{12}^2 \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k} [\Delta(\underline{q}) - \Delta(\underline{q} - \underline{k}) - \Delta(\underline{k})]}{\Delta(\underline{k}) \Delta(\underline{q} - \underline{k})}. \quad (6.20)$$

If we also introduce a transverse momentum cut-off  $\lambda$  in (6.20) then, conceptually at least, we can suppose that, in the renormalization group sense, some range of transverse momenta greater than  $\lambda$  has already been integrated out to give a reggeon trajectory function that is analytic at small transverse momenta. As a first approximation to this trajectory function we can then take

$$\Delta(\underline{q}) = \alpha'(q^2 - M^2), \quad \alpha' \sim M^2/\lambda \quad (6.21)$$

(Note that  $\alpha'$  could also be ‘non-perturbative’ in origin.) Inserting (6.21) into (6.20) then *near the two-particle threshold* we obtain

$$\left[ \frac{r_{12}}{E - \Delta(\underline{q})} \right]^2 \frac{1}{\alpha'} (q^2 - M^2) K(q^2) + \dots \quad (6.22)$$

If we now sum the infinite series of diagrams shown in Fig. 6.11 (in all of which the multiperipheral discontinuity is taken) we obtain a renormalization of the trajectory (6.21), that

is

$$\left[E - \alpha'(q^2 - M^2)\right]^{-1} \rightarrow \left[E - \alpha'(q^2 - M^2) - \frac{r_{12}^2}{\alpha'}(q^2 - M^2)K(q^2)\right]^{-1}. \quad (6.23)$$

Thus the reggeon diagrams of Fig. 6.11 consistently reproduce the perturbative threshold contribution to the gluon trajectory function if we identify

$$\frac{r_{12}^2}{\alpha'} \sim g^2 c_{ijk}^2 \quad (6.24)$$

where  $c_{ijk}$  is a group-dependent factor that we have ignored until this point. Actually if we considered in more detail the symmetry properties of diagrams which follow from their signature properties we would find that the  $c_{ijk}$  must have the antisymmetry properties which identify them as the structure constants of a non-abelian group. However, we will not focus on this aspect and will essentially ignore the  $c_{ijk}$  in the following discussion.

The ‘multiperipheral’ cut of Fig. 6.8 gives the leading threshold behavior (compared to a cut which goes through one or both of the loop reggeons) since it leaves both loop propagators uncut and so leaves the maximum number of particle poles in the loop integral. Note also that if the transverse momentum cut-off is inserted in (6.20) it would not appear in the leading singular behavior at the two-particle threshold.

Clearly the nonsense zero is responsible for ensuring that the diagrams of Fig. 6.11 simply produce reggeization. Indeed if we *take*  $\alpha' \rightarrow 0$  *with*  $g$  *finite* (which is achieved by taking  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ ) then (6.23) *gives exactly the perturbative result*. However, we can also say that we have a straightforward “non-perturbative” formulation of how the *odd-signature* reggeon diagrams of Fig. 6.11 contribute to the odd-signature amplitude and the reggeon trajectory function in particular.  $\alpha'$  can be regarded either as non-perturbative in origin, or as originating from the transverse momentum region above the cut-off. In either case the gauge theory perturbative analysis is exactly as we expect - with a simple *non-singular three reggeon vertex*.

Before discussing the diagrams involving the singular four reggeon vertex, we must first elevate to a major point of principle the need to take a discontinuity in evaluating the diagrams of Figs. 6.8 and 6.11. The derivation of the reggeon unitarity equations in Part I was critically dependent on the breakdown of multiparticle amplitudes into component discontinuities. When odd-signature reggeons are involved, distinct multiple discontinuities

have quite distinct transverse momentum singularities - because of the removal of different products of signature factors. Therefore it is not surprising that the hexagraph loop expansion is a well-defined iteration of the reggeon unitarity equations for an individual hexagraph amplitude only when an appropriate (multiple) discontinuity of the hexagraph is specified.

Although we will not give a detailed construction procedure for a general amplitude we note that a single loop contribution to a multiple discontinuity of a hexagraph amplitude can always be constructed unambiguously via a particular reggeon intermediate state. The corresponding full amplitude can then be obtained (effectively from an asymptotic dispersion relation) by adding the signature factors of the appropriate Sommerfeld-Watson representation. This (loop) amplitude can then be used for the construction of further loop contributions to other hexagraph discontinuities and so on - giving a complete set of multiple loop amplitudes. The full iteration procedure is particularly important for the construction of multiparticle amplitudes but will also be what we implicitly use below to construct the diagrams for elastic scattering which apparently involve the very complicated four-reggeon vertex. As we emphasized above, in the first instance at least, we shall be satisfied with constructing only the leading transverse momentum singularities of a particular hexagraph loop amplitude. This requires that the maximum number of propagators remain uncut - or equivalently that the maximal *multiperipheral* discontinuity, or discontinuities, be taken.

Consider now the one-loop hexagraph contribution to the three-reggeon vertex illustrated in Fig. 6.12. The discontinuities shown leave the maximum number (two) of uncut propagators. As we described in detail in Part I, there is a direct relationship between taking a discontinuity of a hexagraph amplitude and the removal of a particular (often complicated) signature factor. For our present purpose (although not for the more elaborate discussion of effects associated with fermion loops discussed in Section 9) it will be a good enough approximation to take all signature factors to be simple particle poles, as in (6.19), and to assume that a cut through any *adjacent* set of lines in a hexagraph removes the signature factor associated with one and only one of the lines cut. In Fig. 6.12 this is sufficient to determine that the pole factors associated with lines a, b, c and f are removed by the discontinuities taken. If this diagram appears as a sub-diagram in an ‘energy-conserving’ reggeon diagram, there will be two energy denominators to insert and nonsense zeros for each of the vertices. If we assume that the energy integration for the loop has been performed by using the Regge



pole for line b we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
r_{12}^3 \int d^2 \underline{k} [E - \Delta_b - \Delta_e] [\Delta_e(E - \Delta_b - \Delta_e)]^{-1} \\
\times [(E - \Delta_e) - \Delta_c - \Delta_d] [\Delta_d(E - \Delta_c - \Delta_d - \Delta_f)]^{-1} \\
\times [\Delta_f - \Delta_d - \Delta_e]
\end{aligned} \tag{6.25}$$

Clearly both internal reggeon propagators are simply cancelled by the nonsense zeroes in the triple-regge vertices. Consequently the diagram generates no Regge cuts, but instead gives only a renormalization of the triple-regge vertex corresponding to the transverse bubble diagram shown in Fig. 6.13, i.e.

$$\delta\Gamma_{12} = \frac{r_{12}^3}{\pi^2} (q_f^2 - M^2) K_\lambda^{(2)}(q_f^2) \tag{6.26}$$

If we add this contribution, together with the analogous diagram in which c and f are interchanged, to the original triple regge vertex we obtain

$$\Gamma_{12}^R = r_{12} [E - \Delta_R(\underline{k}_1^2) - \Delta_R(\underline{k}_2^2)] \tag{6.27}$$

and  $\Delta_R$  is given by (6.23). Consequently the diagram of Fig. 6.12 simply renormalizes the vertex by shifting the nonsense zero to match the shift of the trajectory produced by the diagrams of Fig. 6.11. That is the vertex acquires the two-particle threshold in each of its transverse momenta. Indeed we emphasize that the calculation keeping only the multiperipheral cut in Fig. 6.12 is only accurate near this threshold. It is possible to show in a similar manner that diagrams of the form illustrated in Fig. 6.14 build up the higher thresholds in the trajectory and vertex function in a similar manner.

Consider next diagrams of the form illustrated in Fig. 6.15 which are produced by the *even signature* coupling of two reggeons to external particles. To build up these diagrams we begin with the single loop diagram shown in Fig. 6.16. The evaluation of Fig. 6.16 is almost identical to that of Fig. 6.12, the only difference being that the energy denominator  $\Gamma_2$  is not removed by a nonsense zero. If we insert this diagram into Fig. 6.17 and use (6.24) and  $\frac{\beta_2}{\alpha} = g^2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
g^6 \int d^2 k_1 d^2 k_2 \frac{1}{\Delta(\underline{k}_1^2)} [E - \Delta(\underline{k}_1^2) - \Delta(\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q})^2]^{-1} \frac{1}{\Delta((\underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2)^2)} \\
\times [E - \Delta(\underline{k}_2^2) - \Delta((\underline{k}_2 - \underline{q})^2)]^{-1} \frac{1}{\Delta((\underline{k}_2 - \underline{q})^2)}
\end{aligned} \tag{6.28}$$

Clearly this is exactly the contribution to the second diagram of the expansion in Fig. 6.2 from one term of what we have been regarding as the singular part of the four-reggeon vertex ( $V(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q})$ ). Indeed the sum of all diagrams of the form of Fig. 6.17 clearly produces the complete contribution of  $V(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q})$ . If we examine the nature of the approximations made, by taking multiperipheral cuts etc., we find that our evaluation of these diagrams is accurate *close to the three particle threshold*.

The above analysis can be extended to the complete series of diagrams shown in Fig. 6.2 (and any other diagram apparently involving the singular four-reggeon interaction) to show that only triple-Regge vertices with nonsense zeroes are involved. In fact the ‘four-reggeon’ interaction has the simple hexagraph representation illustrated in Fig. 6.18. As a result we can conclude that in reality there are no singular reggeon interactions in the reggeized gluon RFT. All transverse momentum singularities are due to the signature factor, or particle pole, in the reggeized gluon propagator *if we construct the diagrams via their discontinuities and utilize a three-reggeon vertex with a nonsense zero*.

This last conclusion is clearly very comforting since it implies that there is no significant mystery or complexity in the reggeon diagrams occurring in a spontaneously broken gauge theory. Apart from the group-structure involved, which we have ignored in our general discussion since it is straightforward, the structure of all interactions is just the simplest expected (for odd-signature reggeons) from the general Regge theory of Part I of this article. Therefore we can, in principle at least, construct the reggeized gluon loop contributions to a general hexagraph amplitude directly from the general formalism that we used to discuss Pomeron amplitudes.

In the most recent work of Bartels[19] extensive non-leading log results are obtained by directly iterating the asymptotic dispersion relations of Part I. Conceptually this should be equivalent to the iteration of hexagraph amplitudes through reggeon unitarity that we have described. However, the approach of Bartels is clearly capable of keeping more detail than we have attempted. In particular Bartels is able to show the existence (to the non-leading order at which he works) of the general class of bootstrap equations which are required to maintain signature rules in higher order diagrams. As we shall discuss further in Section 8 these “self-consistency” equations for the full reggeization of the theory can be regarded as the low transverse momentum consequence of the underlying gauge invariance of the theory, *which must be maintained* by our treatment of massless fermions, for example.

## 7. COMPLIMENTARITY AND THE INFRA-RED ANALYSIS OF TRANSVERSE MOMENTUM DIAGRAMS

From the last Section, it is clear that reggeon diagrams provide a complete description of spontaneously broken gauge theories in the Regge limit. We specifically considered  $SU(2)$  gauge theory but as we partially described in Section 4, there are a large number of results in the literature demonstrating that essentially the same structure emerges for any gauge group and with any fermion and scalar content. Provided the gauge group is non-abelian (or a product of non-abelian groups) and the gauge symmetry is completely broken so that all vector bosons acquire mass, then *all* vectors and fermions reggeize. (In general the scalars do not reggeize). The full Multi-Regge Theory of Part I of this article is therefore applicable to the leading high-energy behavior which originates from the vector bosons and fermions. Given the simple structure of the resulting reggeon diagrams, as described in the last Section, we are clearly encouraged to push the formalism as far as is possible within its own limitations.

Our ultimate purpose is to study unbroken gauge theories and  $QCD$  in particular. Consequently we must consider if, even in principle, we can hope to obtain information about the Regge behavior of an unbroken gauge theory from that of the broken theory. The major problem we have to face, of course, is that in general there are expected to be confinement and chiral-symmetry phase-transitions separating the region of parameter space where our starting perturbative calculations are valid, from the ‘physical’ region of unbroken gauge invariance. This suggests that the S-Matrix for (massive) gluons and quarks is totally unrelated to the hadron S-Matrix that we would like to study. The purpose of this Section is to establish that under certain circumstances the problem of confinement (and chiral symmetry breaking) can be confronted and we can argue that an infra-red limit of the reggeon diagrams of a spontaneously-broken gauge theory can give results relevant to the high-energy behavior of the unbroken theory. This will lead us to consider the potential physical significance of the transverse momentum infra-red divergences which occur in this limit. We begin by discussing the lattice gauge theory result[25] that there can be a smooth relation between the “confining” and “Higgs” regimes of a theory.

## 7.1 Complimentarity for SU(2) Gauge Symmetry

Consider SU(2) gauge theory with a fundamental (that is doublet) Higgs field as discussed in the last Section. The lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2(A) + |(\partial_\mu - igA_\mu)\phi|^2 - \frac{1}{2}h(\phi^*\phi)^2 + \mu^2\phi^*\phi. \quad (7.1)$$

Since  $\phi(x)$  is in the fundamental representation, we can write

$$\phi(x) = \Omega(x) \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \rho(x) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7.2)$$

where  $\Omega(x)$  is an SU(2) matrix. If we write

$$B_\mu = \Omega^+ \left( \frac{1}{g} \partial_\mu - A_\mu \right) \Omega, \quad (7.3)$$

we obtain

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{4}F_\mu \nu^2(B) + (\partial_\mu \rho)^2 + \rho^2 g^2 [B_\mu^+ B_\mu]_{22} + V(\rho). \quad (7.4)$$

Because gauge transformations on A and  $\phi$  can be absorbed by  $\Omega$ , we can define B and  $\rho$  to be gauge independent. Also since  $\Omega$  does not appear in (7.4), we can regard this as an expression for the gauge-invariant lagrangian in terms of gauge-invariant variables. (In fact  $B_\mu$  and  $\rho$  are equal to A and  $\phi$  in the unitary gauge.) For a fermion field  $\psi(x)$  in the fundamental representation, we can also write

$$\chi(x) = \Omega^+(x)\psi(x), \quad (7.5)$$

so that  $\chi(x)$  is a gauge-invariant fermion field.

Consider now the path-ordered line-integral

$$\phi^*(x) \left[ \exp - \int_x^y dx_\mu g A_\mu \right] \phi(y), \quad (7.6)$$

which is, of course, gauge-invariant. This integral is defined as a limit of a product of the form

$$\phi^*(x) \left[ \prod_i \left( \frac{\delta}{\delta x_i} - g A(x_i) \right) \delta x_i \right] \phi(y), \quad (7.7)$$

$$\sim \rho(x) \left[ \prod_i g B(x_i) \delta x_i \right] \rho(y), \quad (7.8)$$

if we use the approximation

$$\Omega(x_i) \Omega(x_{i+1}) \simeq 1. \quad (7.9)$$

Consequently if the Higgs field  $\phi$  develops a continuous classical component (that is a vacuum expectation value) it is possible for a gauge-invariant non-local operator such as (7.6) to factorize into a product of local operators of the form (7.8). This is clearly straightforward if only a finite product is involved in (7.7), as it would be in a lattice theory, so that there is no subtlety involved in defining the “continuum limit” (7.6).

In the confining region of the parameter space for (7.1), which we anticipate to include  $\mu^2$  large and positive, we expect the physical states to be created by operators of the form (7.7) (as well as loop operators involving  $A_\mu$  only and expressions of the form (7.7) involving fermion fields). In the Higgs region, which we anticipate to include  $\mu^2$  large and negative, we expect the physical states to be created instead by local gauge-invariant operators of the form of  $\rho(x)$  and  $B(x)$ . The above discussion suggests that the two kinds of states are not really distinct if (7.8) holds, and so in this case it should be possible to go smoothly from one region of parameter space to the other *without encountering a phase-transition*. This smoothness property, known as *complimentarity*[25], has indeed been verified in a number of lattice studies of the theory with the phase-diagram of Fig. 7.1 shown to be the appropriate description. It has also been shown that if  $\phi(x)$  is in a higher representation than the fundamental (so that (7.2), (7.3), (7.5), and (7.8) can no longer be written), then the line of phase-transitions in Fig. 7.1 extends across the whole phase-diagram and so it is impossible to go from the Higgs regime to the confining regime without encountering a phase-transition.

From our point of view, the significance of complimentarity is that “string-like” states can form smoothly from perturbative gluon states. This is clearly vital if we expect to build a Pomeron related to a flux-tube picture starting from perturbative calculations. Note that it is only for strong-coupling that there is no phase-transition encountered in Fig. 7.1. Since the continuum limits in the confining and Higgs regime would be expected to be taken as shown, we would not expect complimentarity to hold, in general, in the continuum. (The continuum limit of the Higgs theory may very well not exist since it is not asymptotically free.) We conclude therefore that to apply complimentarity straightforwardly in an infra-red analysis of reggeon diagrams, we *must keep an ultra-violet cut-off*. In general there is no

gauge-invariant alternative to the lattice cut-off. Fortunately, the transverse momentum and reggeon diagrams we have described in the last Section are gauge-invariant and so imposing a *transverse momentum cut-off* in such diagrams is a *gauge-invariant ultra-violet cut-off in the Regge limit*. As we have discussed, to derive the diagrams from the underlying Feynman diagrams, it is technically convenient (if not necessary) to impose a  $\underline{k}_\perp$  cut-off from the outset and only remove it when a gauge-invariant result is obtained. We are now arguing that this cut-off should not be removed until *after* the infra-red limit we consider has been taken. Indeed we reached exactly the same conclusion in the last Section by considering the validity of the multi-Regge approximation for production amplitudes.

Our first conclusion is therefore that if we consider the limit in which the vector-boson mass  $M$  given by (6.4) goes to zero, we should take limits in the order

$$i) \quad M \equiv g\langle\rho\rangle \rightarrow 0, \quad ii) \quad \lambda \rightarrow \infty, \quad (7.10)$$

where  $\lambda$  is the transverse momentum cut-off. This will correspond to going around the phase-transition line in Fig. 7.1 by first going from the Higgs to the confinement regime (at a finite value of the coupling) and then taking the continuum limit in the confinement regime. As we have discussed this procedure allows the appropriate string-like states to form before the ultra-violet cut-off is removed.

An additional subtlety we should discuss is that there are two parameters in the Higgs sector of (7.1), whereas in the lattice phase-diagram of Fig. 7.1, there is only one parameter, that is  $\langle\rho\rangle$ . This is because lattice theories effectively fix the magnitude of the Higgs field and so fix  $h$  in the continuum theory. We shall assume that we can exploit complimentary and also decouple the Higgs field entirely in the limit *i)* of (7.10) if we take  $\langle\rho\rangle \rightarrow 0$  by taking

$$-\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty \quad \text{with} \quad \frac{\mu^2}{h} \rightarrow 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\mu^4}{h} \rightarrow \infty. \quad (7.11)$$

Note that adding  $h$  to any diagram in perturbation theory always involves the addition of two accompanying propagators. Therefore, *if there is an ultra-violet momentum cut-off*, such an addition multiplies the diagram by a factor of

$$\int \frac{h}{(p_1^2 - \mu^2)(p_2^2 - \mu^2)} \quad \xrightarrow{\mu^2 \rightarrow \infty} \quad \frac{h}{\mu^4}, \quad (7.12)$$

and so decouples such a diagram in the limit (6.11). Consequently the Higgs sector decouples entirely in this limit and we are left with only the massless gauge field sector. (Note that

that the large momentum region would, in general, lead to a violation of (7.12) if there was no momentum cut-off).

## 7.2 SU(3) Gauge Symmetry

If we add to an SU(N) gauge theory R scalar fields which are N-tuplets under the gauge group and then give expectation values to all such fields, the gauge symmetry is, in general, broken[34] from SU(N) to SU(N-R). To break SU(3) gauge symmetry completely, and also exploit complementarity, we must therefore add two triplets of Higgs scalars. Giving the triplets distinct expectation values produces *two* vector-boson mass-scales  $M_1^2$  and  $M_2^2$ . We shall extract maximal information from our analysis if we separate the limits in which these mass-scales go to zero. That is we decouple the two triplet scalars separately so that

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{no gauge symmetry} \\ + \text{SU(2) global symmetry} \end{array} \right\} \xrightarrow{M_1^2 \rightarrow 0} \text{SU(2) gauge symmetry} \quad (7.13)$$

$$\xrightarrow{M_2^2 \rightarrow 0} \text{SU(3) gauge symmetry.} \quad (7.14)$$

For reasons that we shall describe, we shall eventually prefer to remove the  $\lambda$  cut-off immediately after taking the first infra-red limit. However, we can expect the additional infra-red limit(s) to be insensitive to the cut-off only if the *complete spontaneously-broken theory* is asymptotically free - so that a cut-off is effectively generated dynamically. For this and other reasons already discussed in Section 3, we will eventually add the maximum number of quarks consistent with the asymptotic freedom of QCD. In this special case the theory with one Higgs triplet that we obtain after the first limit (7.13) is taken, is indeed asymptotically free in both the gauge coupling and the Higgs coupling. We can therefore take the limit  $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$  at this stage and hope that (an extended version of) complementarity will then allow us to take a limit of the form (7.11) in which  $M_2^2 \rightarrow 0$ , and smoothly obtain unbroken QCD - with a very large number of quarks! (Of course, adding the quarks necessarily involves us in the additional problem of chiral symmetry breaking which we shall discuss shortly). In this special case, therefore, we may be able to reach unbroken QCD by taking limits in the order

$$i) \ M_1^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad ii) \ \lambda \rightarrow \infty \quad iii) \ M_2^2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (7.15)$$

When  $M_1^2 \rightarrow 0$  and we have SU(2) gauge symmetry, the massive and massless vector

bosons have the group structure discussed in detail in Section 11. There are two massive SU(2) doublets, which will not produce physical vector particles, and one SU(2) singlet. This singlet *will give a physical particle* and if we have removed the ultra-violet cut-off, as in *ii)* of (7.15), we can identify  $M_2$  in *iii)* as the actual *physical mass* of this vector particle. As we shall discuss in later sections, this vector remains reggeized in the infra-red limit  $M_1^2 \rightarrow 0$ . Consequently we have a *reggeized, massive vector which becomes massless*, and (presumably) *decouples from the physical spectrum*, as the full SU(3) gauge symmetry is restored. This already suggests, as we noted in Section 3, a potential relationship between the restoration of the full gauge symmetry of QCD and the limit giving the Critical Pomeron from the Super-Critical Pomeron discussed in Section 7 of Part I. However, it will require considerable further analysis in the following sections to illuminate all aspects of this relationship!

We now go on to discuss how it is that the infra-red divergences of reggeon diagrams can have the physical significance required to give a confining gauge theory. That is *the appropriate physical states* can be obtained simply by considering the infra-red limits discussed above. To this end we briefly consider the infra-red divergences of transverse momentum diagrams in QED.

### 7.3 Divergences of QED Transverse Momentum Diagrams

Because of the photon numerators, the box-diagram for electron scattering gives (from (5.10))

$$\sim \alpha^2 s (\ln s - i\pi) K(t, M^2), \quad (7.16)$$

where  $K(t, M^2)$  is given by (5.11) and  $M$  is now the photon mass. Adding the crossed diagram as in Fig. 7.2 gives

$$\sim \alpha^2 i\pi K(t, M^2), \quad (7.17)$$

$$\xrightarrow{M^2 \rightarrow 0} 2\alpha^2 i\pi \ln[M^2/t], \quad (7.18)$$

with each pole in  $K$  contributing additively to the logarithmic divergence.

Higher-order infra-red divergences come only from the sum  $\Sigma$  of photon exchange diagrams of the form of Fig. 5.4, which also includes single photon exchange. In the Regge limit, this sum gives the sum of transverse momentum diagrams shown in Fig. 5.5. The sum



$\Sigma$  is well-known to eikonalize and as a consequence the infra-red divergences of the diagrams of Fig. 5.5 exponentiate to give

$$\sum_{M^2 \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\alpha}{t} \exp \left[ i\alpha \ln(M^2/t) \right] \equiv \frac{\alpha}{t} "e^{i\theta}" \quad (7.19)$$

which demonstrates that the transverse momentum diagrams correctly give[42] “ $\theta$ ” the *infinite Coulomb phase* of QED.

In the  $t$ -channel (where  $s$  is negative) the sum  $\Sigma$  contains only real radiation divergences which are well known to exponentiate and give[43, 44]

$$\sum_{M^2 \rightarrow 0} \exp \left[ \sum_{i,j=1,2} e_i e'_j p_i p'_j \int \frac{d^4 q}{(q^2 + M^2)(p_i \cdot q)(p'_j \cdot q)} \right] \times \text{finite part} \quad (7.20)$$

$$\equiv \exp[R] \times \text{finite part}. \quad (7.21)$$

$R$  is real and can, of course, be factorized and absorbed into the definition of external electron states. Also[43] if  $R$  is continued from the  $t$ -channel to the  $s$ -channel, the divergent Coulomb phase is generated as the imaginary part of  $R$ , that is

$$[R] \xrightarrow{s \text{ above threshold}} [R] + i[\theta] \quad (7.22)$$

It is well known that a photon mass can be added smoothly to QED without producing a phase transition. It is also well-known that the factorization of divergences (as the mass is removed) into eikonal factors absorbed into the definition of external states as in (7.21) is equivalent to the modification of the field operator for a charged fermion by the incorporation of a line-integral of the form appearing in (7.6). If this line-integral extends to infinity, then a gauge-invariant operator is obtained which simultaneously creates a charged particle and a “cloud” of soft photons. Therefore we can summarize the foregoing discussion by saying that in QED, transverse momentum diagram divergences determine the divergent  $s$ -channel *imaginary-part* of the “non-local” string-like factors needed to define gauge-invariant  $t$ -channel states.

## 7.4 Infra-red Divergences in Non-Abelian Gauge Theories

From the point of view of Regge theory, which links  $t$ -channel bound-states to  $s$ -channel high-energy behavior, it is natural that transverse momentum divergences of  $s$ -

channel high-energy diagrams determine  $t$ -channel states. In QED the result is a relatively trivial  $s$ -channel exponentiation which reflects the well-known necessity to define gauge-invariant states as including a cloud of soft-photons. In a non-abelian theory, the reggeization of the gluons leads to an entirely distinct “ $t$ -channel exponentiation” of divergences, that is

$$s^{\alpha(t)} \equiv s^{1+(t-M^2)g^2/16\pi^2 K(M,t)} \quad (7.23)$$

$$_{M^2 \rightarrow 0} \sim s \exp[g^2/16\pi^2 t \ln s \ln(M^2/t)] \quad (7.24)$$

The physical significance of this new exponentiation has, until this point, not been well-understood. It is the purpose of the following Sections to analyze its ramifications in detail, using the full technology of the multi-Regge theory developed in Part I and in previous Sections. The major question will be whether we can, under appropriate conditions, *link the divergences to confinement*.

There is yet a further complication in attempting to extract the infra-red divergence structure of a non-abelian theory from transverse momentum diagrams. The infra-red growth of the gauge coupling (which is absent in QED) provides a source of infra-red problems which we *can not analyse or control* in terms of transverse momentum diagrams. Of course, it is precisely this growth which provides the basis of the conventional understanding of confinement in non-abelian theories. Not surprisingly, perhaps, we have to conclude that the conventional confinement mechanism can not be studied within our formalism.

In fact the conventional confinement possibility is eliminated and *transverse momentum divergences are the only divergence problem* if we not only add the maximum number of quarks allowed by asymptotic freedom (motivated by our desire to obtain an asymptotically-free spontaneously-broken theory) but, as we discussed in some detail in Section 3, we also make all quarks massless. This produces an *infra-red fixed-point* for the gauge coupling. Consequently this coupling no longer grows in the infra-red region and the conventional form of confinement definitely can not be realised. However, we also anticipated in Section 3 that a related form of confinement (involving the quark sea and the anomaly in a crucial manner) can take place. In effect, the removal of the large distance growth of the gauge coupling implies that the problem of confinement reduces to (the non-abelian version of) the S-Matrix infra-red divergence problem. In this case we might anticipate that, in parallel with our discussion of QED, complementarity will allow some approximation to the appropriate “string-like” states to emerge from the infra-red limit - that is *from the infra-red divergences*

*of reggeon diagrams.* Clearly the question of chiral symmetry breaking is also reduced to a study of the infra-red limit. That is the divergences either do, or do not, produce a particle spectrum consistent with chiral symmetry breaking.

We emphasize that if we demonstrate some form of confinement through our analysis, then it will be in circumstances in which *the conventional understanding of confinement does not hold*. Indeed we shall compare our results with the various manifestations of confinement in the Schwinger model in Section 11. It is also interesting at this stage to note Gribov's argument[45] that the infra-red growth of the gauge-coupling is eliminated in *QCD* if quark loops are not Pauli-Villars regulated. Gribov also argues for a close relationship between confinement and the quark sea anomaly in this case. In fact we shall discover in Section 9 that we are forced to not Pauli-Villars regulate quark reggeon diagrams by our transverse momentum cut-off requirement. It could be therefore that it is a natural extension of our procedure to assume that the gauge-coupling simply does not grow in the infra-red region and that although *it is essential that some massless quarks be present during our analysis* we only need introduce a large number of flavors into our discussion when we require asymptotic-freedom for the Higgs sector we have added.

For the moment we shall assume that the large number of massless flavors is necessary to halt the infra-red growth of the gauge coupling. Therefore we propose to study "flavor-saturated QCD" and to study the infra-red divergences of the reggeon diagrams obtained by adding two triplets of Higgs scalars and using the Higgs mechanism. We shall restore the gauge symmetry through the sequence (7.13)–(7.14) with the goal of taking limits in the order (7.15). As we shall see, it will be essential that (some) quarks remain massless during the infra-red limit *i)* of (7.15). If confinement is produced by the infra-red divergences of limit *i)* as our analysis will suggest, then quark-masses can be smoothly added after limits *ii)* and *iii)* are taken.

## 8. INFRA-RED ANALYSIS OF SU(2) REGGEON DIAGRAMS

In this Section we begin our infra-red analysis of reggeon diagrams. Our ultimate aim is to discuss the sequence of limits (7.15) for QCD. However, we shall initially study the simple limit  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$  of the pure SU(2) gauge theory diagrams. Much of our discussion will also apply to the restoration of any gauge symmetry by a single limit in which all gluons become massless and the Higgs sector decouples completely.

### 8.1 Trajectory Function and Reggeon Interaction Divergences

It is straightforward to pick out the infra-red divergences of the transverse momentum integrals (5.31)-(5.40) as the various propagators go on-shell. To serve our general purpose we shall immediately describe these divergences in the triple-reggeon diagram formalism outlined at the end of Section 6.

Consider first the trajectory function integral  $\Delta(q^2)$  generated by the reggeon diagram of Fig. 6.8 as discussed in Section 6. This diverges as follows

$$\Delta(\underline{q}^2) \underset{M^2 \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \frac{-g^2 \underline{q}^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k}}{(\underline{k}^2 + M^2) ((\underline{q} - \underline{k})^2 + M^2)} \quad (8.1)$$

$$\sim \ln \left[ \frac{M^2}{\underline{q}^2} \right] \frac{g^2 \pi}{(2\pi)^3} \left[ \underline{q}^2 \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k} \delta^2(\underline{k})}{(\underline{q} - \underline{k})^2} + \underline{q}^2 \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k} \delta^2(\underline{q} - \underline{k})}{\underline{k}^2} \right] \quad (8.2)$$

$$\sim \frac{g^2}{(2\pi)^2} \ln \left[ \frac{M^2}{\underline{q}^2} \right] \quad (8.3)$$

Therefore the full divergence is the sum of the divergences resulting from one propagator or the other going on-shell. We also see a feature that we shall exploit extensively. The coefficient of the logarithmic divergence from single transverse propagator is simply given by replacing the propagator by a  $\delta$ -function. If we denote the divergence due to an on mass-shell massless gluon by a dashed line, then the trajectory function divergence is associated with the two diagrams of Fig. 8.1.

As we have discussed, the singular four-reggeon interaction is derived from triple reggeon diagrams in the infra-red region and the infra-red divergences when either of the propagators in (6.10) goes on shell are represented as in Fig. 8.2. The resulting  $\delta$ -functions simply imply that transverse momentum is conserved in the through-going reggeon lines,

giving

$$\begin{aligned}
V(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q}) &\xrightarrow{M^2 \rightarrow 0} \left\{ \pi \delta^2(\underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2) \left[ \underline{k}_1^2 (\underline{k}_2 - \underline{q})^2 + \underline{k}_2^2 (\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q})^2 \right] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \pi \delta^2(\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2) \left[ \underline{k}_1^2 \underline{k}_2^2 + (\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1)^2 (\underline{q} - \underline{k}_2)^2 \right] \right\} \ln M^2
\end{aligned} \tag{8.4}$$

Therefore the exchange diagrams of Fig. 8.2 generate logarithmic divergences with identical transverse momentum dependence to those generated by the self-interaction diagrams of Fig. 8.1. This motivates the incorporation of the self-interaction diagrams in a full reggeon kernel defined as follows (we include all momentum conservation  $\delta$ -functions in the definition and normalize all two-dimensional integrals by  $(2\pi)^{-3}$ ). As illustrated in Fig. 8.3 we define

$$\begin{aligned}
K_2^I(\underline{q}, \underline{q}', \underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2) &= (2\pi)^3 \delta^2(\underline{q} - \underline{q}') R_{2,2}^I(\underline{q}, \underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2) \\
&\quad + (2\pi)^6 \delta^2(\underline{q} - \underline{q}') (\underline{k}_1^2 + M^2) ((\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1)^2 + M^2) \left[ \Delta(\underline{k}_1^2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \Delta((\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q})^2) \right] \left[ \frac{1}{2} \delta^2(\underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2) + \frac{1}{2} \delta^2(\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{8.5}$$

where  $R_{2,2}^I$  is given by (6.9) and the remaining terms are given by the self-interaction diagrams. Utilizing (6.10) and (6.11) together with (8.3) we see that the  $\log M^2$  divergences in  $K_2^0$  directly cancel. This is a central result which we write as

$$K_2^0 \xrightarrow{M^2 \rightarrow 0} \tilde{K}_2^0(\underline{q}, \underline{q}', \underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2) \tag{8.6}$$

where  $\tilde{K}_2^0$  is a complicated scale-invariant distribution having the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{K}_2^0 &\sim \delta^2(\underline{q} - \underline{q}') \delta^2(\underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2) \underline{k}_1^2 (\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1)^2 \ln \left[ \underline{k}_1^2 / (\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q})^2 \right] \\
&\quad + \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{8.7}$$

From (6.11) we see that  $C_I$  decreases as  $I$  increases and so for any non-zero  $I$  there is no cancellation of the  $\log M^2$  divergences in  $K_2^I$ , that is

$$K_2^I \xrightarrow{M^2 \rightarrow 0} \infty \quad I \neq 0 \tag{8.8}$$

Consequently for non-zero  $I$ , the reggeization divergences of the self-interaction diagrams are not removed and for  $I \geq 2$  are actually enhanced by the exchange diagrams.

There is also an important zero of  $R_{2,2}^I$  when  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$  which can be thought of as a *consequence of gauge-invariance* and is vital for the general infra-red divergence structure. First we note that

$$V(0, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q}) \xrightarrow{M^2 \rightarrow 0} 2\underline{q}^2 \quad (8.9)$$

Therefore since  $a_I = -\frac{C_I}{2}$  it follows from (6.9) that

$$R_{2,2}^I(\underline{k}_1 = 0, \underline{q}, M^2 = 0) = 0 \quad (8.10)$$

and in fact

$$R_{2,2}^I(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q}, M^2 = 0) \xrightarrow{\underline{k}_1 \rightarrow 0} \left[ -4\underline{q} + 2 \frac{\underline{q}^2}{\underline{k}_2^2} \underline{k}_2 + 2 \frac{\underline{q}^2(\underline{q} - \underline{k}_2)}{(\underline{q} - \underline{k}_2)^2} \right] \cdot \underline{k}_1 \quad (8.11)$$

In general this linear zero is sufficient to remove a  $(\underline{k}_1^2)^{-1}$  divergence from a propagator - leaving only an integrable  $(\underline{k}_1^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$  singularity.

The zero (8.10) can be understood as following from a Ward Identity for the  $\underline{k}_1$  gluon and (8.11) is, of course, the form of zero that we would expect as a consequence of gauge invariance. There is, however, another way of understanding the origin of the zero (8.10) in terms of the S-Matrix on mass-shell formalism we are developing. This will be fundamental for our discussion of the contribution of massless quarks, which begins in the next Section. We consider a general reggeized gluon amplitude, as illustrated in Fig. 8.4 and consider the behavior of the amplitude as  $\underline{k}^2 \rightarrow 0$ , where  $\underline{k}$  is the transverse momentum of one gluon. We consider reconstructing this amplitude via the unitarity equation in the corresponding  $t$ -channel, or equivalently use the  $s$ -channel unitarity plus dispersion relation construction (5.49)-(5.53). In either case (as we have been emphasizing) we reconstruct the reggeon amplitude via the contribution of on-shell intermediate states, as illustrated in Fig. 8.4. It now follows that if the reggeized gluon is massless and goes on shell it must decouple (that is the zero (8.10) must appear) because a physical transition into the  $t$ -channel gluon intermediate states is not allowed. We shall see that *this argument does not go through if the  $t$ -channel intermediate states are massless quarks.*

## 8.2 The Infra-Red Finiteness of $I = 0$ Reggeon Diagrams

Consider now the full four-reggeon amplitude  $T_{2,2}^I$  defined by the sequence of diagrams

illustrated in Fig. 8.5 and which we can represent formally as

$$T_{2,2}^I(E, \underline{q}, \underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2) = K_2^I + \int d\Omega_2 K_2^I \Gamma_{2,2}^I K_2^I + \cdots \quad (8.12)$$

$$\equiv K + K\Gamma K + K\Gamma K\Gamma K + \cdots \quad (8.13)$$

where

$$\int d\Omega_2 = \int d^2 \underline{k} d^2 \underline{k}' \delta(\underline{q} - \underline{k} - \underline{k}') \quad (8.14)$$

and  $\Gamma_{2,2}^I$  is the two-reggeon propagator

$$\Gamma_{2,2}^I(E, \underline{k}, \underline{k}') = [\underline{k}^2 + M^2]^{-1} [(\underline{k}')^2 + M^2]^{-1} [E - \alpha'(\underline{k}^2 + M^2) - \alpha'((\underline{k}')^2 + M^2)] \quad (8.15)$$

where, as discussed in Section 6,  $\alpha'$  can be viewed as non-perturbative in origin or as originating from interactions above the transverse momentum cut-off. ( $\alpha'$  can equally well be set to zero in the following discussion.)

For  $\underline{q}$ ,  $\underline{k}_1$ ,  $\underline{k}_2$  non-zero, the zeroes of the form (8.11) are sufficient to remove those divergences in  $T_{2,2}^I$  which would result from the propagator poles in  $\Gamma_{2,2}^I$ . In effect *a consequence of gauge invariance is that, in off-shell reggeon amplitudes, there are no divergences directly associated with reggeon intermediate states.* Divergences can come only from the kernels  $K_2^I$ . Therefore, for  $I=0$ , (8.6) implies that each term in the series (8.12) is finite as  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$ , while (8.8) implies that for  $I$  non-zero each term in the series is infinite. From the definition (8.12) it follows that

$$T_{2,2}^I \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\underline{k}_1^2 \rightarrow M^2} \\ (\underline{k}_1 - \underline{q})^2 \rightarrow M^2 \end{array} \quad T_2^I \quad \begin{array}{c} \xrightarrow{\underline{k}_2^2 \rightarrow M^2} \\ (\underline{k}_2 - \underline{q})^2 \rightarrow M^2 \end{array} \quad T^I \quad (8.16)$$

where  $T_2^I$  is the gluon-reggeon scattering amplitude appearing in (6.13) and (6.14). The combination of (8.8) and (8.12) is sufficient to prove that  $T_2^0$  is finite (for non-zero  $\underline{q}$ ,  $\underline{k}$ ) as  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$ .

$T^0$  is not finite because (8.10) no longer holds when  $\underline{k}_2 = 0$ . However, if  $T^0$  is regarded as defined by the sequence of diagrams in Fig. 8.6, then it is clear from the representation of  $T^0$  in terms of  $T_2^0$  that the infra-red divergences can arise only from the last transverse momentum integration performed. To discuss further how such divergences might be eliminated and also what is the significance of the infinities in  $T_{2,2}^I$  and  $T_2^I$  for  $I$  non-zero, we need

to consider the general relationship of reggeon unitarity to the exponentiation of infra-red divergences.

### 8.3 Exponentiation of Divergences and Reggeon Unitarity

From (7.24) we already see that the infra-red divergences of  $T^1$  produce a simple exponentiation in rapidity space. This exponentiation can be straightforwardly undone using the Fourier transform relation (6.7). This shows that in the  $E$ -plane the series (7.24) corresponds to

$$\frac{1}{tE} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} E^{-n} \left[ \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \ln \left( \frac{M^2}{t} \right) \right]^n = \frac{1}{t \left[ E - \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} \ln \left( \frac{M^2}{t} \right) \right]} \quad (8.17)$$

$$M^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} 0 \quad \frac{1}{\ln M^2} \longrightarrow 0 \quad (8.18)$$

In this simple example we see how exponential suppression in rapidity space is equivalent to inversion of the infra-red divergence in the  $E$ -plane amplitude - leading to *complete removal of any  $E$ -plane singularity*. Removal of the  $E$ -plane singularity implies, of course, that when the Fourier integral over  $E$  is carried out, the answer will simply be zero.

It is a general property of the reggeon unitarity equations ((5.45) and (5.46) of I) that the nature of any reggeon singularity is inverted by iteration. (A similar property holds for a conventional unitarity equation). We also demonstrated in (6.20)–(6.24) that although the two-reggeon propagator was eventually eliminated, reggeon diagrams can be utilised to reproduce the contribution of the corresponding nonsense particle state which produces the contribution  $\Delta(\underline{k}^2)$  to the reggeon trajectory function. Consider therefore the unitarity equation for the two-reggeon cut. This gives

$$\text{disc } T_{2,2}^I = [T_{2,2}^I]^+ - [T_{2,2}^I]^- = \int d\Omega_2 \delta\Gamma_{2,2}^I [T_{2,2}^I]^+ [T_{2,2}^I]^- \quad (8.19)$$

where

$$\delta\Gamma_{2,2}^I = (\underline{k}^2 + M^2)^{-1} (\underline{k}' + M^2)^{-1} \delta \left[ E - \alpha'(\underline{k}^2 + M^2) - \alpha'((\underline{k}')^2 + M^2) \right] \quad (8.20)$$

If we write formally

$$\delta\Omega = \int d\Omega_2 \delta\Gamma_{2,2}^I \quad (8.21)$$



to denote the discontinuity due to the singularity of the two-reggeon phase-space then (8.19) gives directly

$$\text{disc} [T_{2,2}^I]^{-1} \sim \delta\Omega \quad (8.22)$$

and so near the two-reggeon branch-point

$$T_{2,2}^I \sim \frac{1}{C^I + \delta\Omega} \quad (8.23)$$

where  $C^I$  is non-singular at this branch-point. It is straightforward to extend this argument to give

$$T_2^I \sim \frac{C_1^I}{C^I + \delta\Omega} \quad (8.24)$$

and

$$T^I \sim C_2^I + \frac{(C_1^I)^2}{C^I + \delta\Omega} \quad (8.25)$$

where  $C_1^I$  and  $C_2^I$  are also non-singular at the branch-point. It follows from (8.23)–(8.25) that any infra-red divergence will be inverted in E-plane amplitudes if can be constructed via reggeon diagrams in such a manner that the divergence originates within the two reggeon phase-space  $\delta\Omega$ . Also since reggeon unitarity implies a similar form to (8.25) for any reggeon cut it clearly follows that in general an infra-red divergence will be inverted in E-space (that is exponentiated in rapidity-space) whenever it originates from a (wrong-signature) nonsense state that can be directly associated with one or more reggeon states.

However, we argued above that gauge invariance implies that physical reggeon states (i.e. reggeon states in which signature does not eliminate the reggeon propagator) do not give divergences. To reconcile the arguments, we note that the divergence of  $K^I$  given by (8.8) can be seen in terms of (8.23)–(8.25) as follows. First we consider the compatibility of (8.13) with (8.23). This is straightforward since (8.13) has the formal sum

$$T_{2,2}^I \sim \frac{\hat{K}^I}{1 + \Gamma K^I} \quad (8.26)$$

where  $\hat{K}^I$  is not integrated over phase-space and so is finite at a general point. Therefore, formally

$$T_{2,2}^I \sim \frac{1}{\frac{1}{K^I} + \delta\Omega} \quad (8.27)$$

and so if we go to the two-reggeon branch-point with  $M^2$  non-zero (8.23) is valid. However, from (8.26) it is clear that for *non-zero*  $I$

$$T_{2,2}^I \sim T_2^I \sim T^I \quad M^2 \rightarrow 0 \quad \frac{1}{K^I} \rightarrow 0 \quad (8.28)$$

and so all amplitudes with non-zero  $I$  vanish as  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$ .

To derive (8.28) from reggeon unitarity we have to view the divergences within  $K_2^I$  as originating directly from (wrong-signature) *three-reggeon contributions* that are cancelled as angular-momentum plane singularities by nonsense-zeroes, but remain as nonsense-state transverse momentum singularities. In this case (8.28) can be interpreted as due to representations of the form of (8.23)–(8.25) but with  $\delta\Omega$  due to the three-reggeon state so that  $\delta\Omega \sim K \rightarrow \infty$ . As a general property we conclude that whether we regard a divergence as occurring within a reggeon interaction or as due to a wrong-signature reggeon state it will be inverted because of reggeon unitarity and will eliminate any physical reggeon state to which it couples.

There is, nevertheless, a further subtlety in drawing conclusions from (8.23)–(8.25) which is crucial for the properties of the  $I = 0$  channel. First we note that if  $T^0$  is defined by the series of diagrams in Fig. 8.6, then the only angular-momentum plane singularity of each term is the two-reggeon cut. Consequently  $T^0$  can be written as an integral over the two-reggeon discontinuity, that is, as illustrated in Fig. 8.7,

$$\text{disc } T^0 = \int d\Omega_2 \delta\Gamma_{2,2}^0 [T_2^0]^+ [T_2^0]^- \quad (8.29)$$

and since  $T_2^0$  is infra-red finite, the divergence of  $T^0$  can arise only when we evaluate the discontinuity. Apparently, the infra-red divergence of  $T^0$  can be viewed as due to the two-reggeon state in general (specifically, of course, it is due to the one-particle pole in  $\delta\Gamma_{2,2}^0$ ) rather than the last (or first) loop appearing in Fig. 8.6. From this last viewpoint, (8.25) appears to imply that the divergence of  $T^0$  should be inverted. However, the argument fails in this case because because the zero (8.10) in  $R_{2,2}^0$  implies that the basic four-reggeon coupling *vanishes* at the divergence point. In the notation of (8.27), this implies that  $K^I$  vanishes and in (8.23)

$$C^0 \gtrsim \delta\Omega \quad (8.30)$$

The finiteness of  $T_2^0$  implies also that  $C_1^0 \sim C^0$  and so

$$T^0 \sim C_1^0 \gtrsim \delta \Omega \quad (8.31)$$

Consequently, this divergence will be inverted *only if there is an  $I = 0$  four-reggeon interaction which does not vanish* at the divergence point - that is an  $I = 0$  interaction which *does not have the zero* (8.10). In effect the divergence occurs because the two-reggeon coupling to particle gluon states does not satisfy the constraints of gauge invariance. To invert it we must find a four-reggeon interaction which also violates the constraints of gauge-invariance. To do so we shall need to discuss the properties of massless quarks in some detail.

## 8.4 General Reggeon Kernels

It is straightforward to anticipate the generalization of the above discussion to a general N-reggeon state. We define the kernel for such a state as the full set of reggeon diagrams describing its propagation that are *irreducible* with respect to the state. This *includes the reggeon self-interaction diagrams* and, as for  $K_2^0$ , also includes all relevant momentum conservation  $\delta$ -functions. For the present we shall effectively assume that the reggeons involved are reggeized ( $\alpha'$  is non-zero) without the inclusion of the self-interaction diagrams but they could as well be elementary massless gluons. Within the general triple-regge formalism all infra-red divergences originate from the particle pole in the reggeon propagator (6.2). We always refer to the corresponding massless particle as a gluon and use the dashed line notation of Figs. 8.1 and 8.2. The structure of higher-order divergences is then determined by the combination of gluon divergences and the nonsense-zero of the triple-reggeon vertex. That is, in the infra-red region the nonsense-zero cancels the gluon pole associated with the distinct single leg of the vertex whenever the gluon poles associated with the other two legs both produce divergences. The divergences of some higher-order diagrams are illustrated in Fig. 8.8.

Denoting the kernel for an N-reggeon state with t-channel isospin as  $K_N^I$  we generalize the last sub-section to

*A –  $K_N^0$  has a finite limit  $\tilde{K}_N^0$  as  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$*

*B –  $K_N^I$  is infra-red divergent due to uncanceled self-interaction divergences ( $I \neq 0$ ).*

Generalizing the above discussion of the two-reggeon state we clearly expect property B to lead to a generalization of the exponentiation of (7.24) to all channels with non-zero

isospin  $I$ . We also expect property  $A$  to lead to finite,  $I = 0$ ,  $N$ -reggeon scattering amplitudes  $T_{N,N}^0$  and also finite two-particle  $\rightarrow N$ -reggeon amplitudes  $T_N^0$ . There will be *divergent*  $N$ -reggeon cut contributions (generalizing (8.29)) to  $T^0$ . This last set of divergences implies that the massless limit does not exist for particle scattering amplitudes.

We can summarize the situation by saying that the decoupling (8.10) softens the infrared contribution of all gluon reggeon states to the point that there are no infinities coming *directly from reggeon states* in reggeon scattering amplitudes. For  $I$  non-zero, the divergent kernels  $K_N^I$  nevertheless remove all such reggeon states - via the corresponding generalization of (8.26)-(8.28). For  $I = 0$ , the finiteness of the  $K_N^0$  allows the corresponding reggeon states to survive. As a result all amplitudes, even those that are finite, have singularities due to gluon reggeon states at zero momentum transfer. Consequently not only is *there is no sensible massless limit—even in the  $I = 0$  channels* for particle scattering amplitudes, but there are also gluon reggeon states remaining in all reggeon amplitudes i.e. *there is no confinement*.

## 8.5 Scale-Invariance and the Lipatov Pomeron

Since the kernel  $K_2^0$  defined by (8.5)–(8.7) is dimensionless, it follows that it, and indeed all the  $K_N^0$ , must be scale-invariant functions (distributions). If we temporarily ignore the transverse momentum cut-off  $\lambda$  that we have argued we should impose, we can study the Fredholm norm of the massive kernel  $K_2^0$ . In fact

$$\begin{aligned} ||K_2^0||^2 &= \int \prod_i \frac{d^2 \underline{k}_i}{(\underline{k}_i^2 + M^2)} K_2^0(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{k}_3, \underline{k}_4, M^2) \\ &\sim \int_{|\underline{k}_i^2| > \lambda} \prod_i \frac{d^2 \underline{k}_i}{\underline{k}_i^2} \tilde{K}_2^0(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{k}_3, \underline{k}_4) \end{aligned} \quad (8.32)$$

$$\equiv \infty \quad (8.33)$$

where the infinity comes from the *ultra-violet* region

$$|\underline{k}_1|^2 \sim |\underline{k}_2|^2 \sim |\underline{k}_3|^2 \sim |\underline{k}_4|^2 \longrightarrow \infty \quad (8.34)$$

and is directly due to the scale-invariance of  $K_2^0$ . In general *without the transverse momentum cut-off* the  $K_N^0$  all have infinite norm and are *non-Fredholm kernels*.

A Fredholm kernel generates only Regge poles in the angular momentum plane, whereas the ultra-violet divergence of a non-Fredholm kernel, in general, produces fixed

(that is  $t$ -independent) singularities. Indeed when the iteration of Fig. 8.5 is carried out for  $K_2^0$ , *without the cut-off*  $\lambda$ , it is well-known that a branch-point - the “Lipatov Pomeron” - is generated[14] at

$$E = -g^2(2\ln 2)/\pi^2 \quad \equiv \quad j = 1 + g^2(2\ln 2)/\pi^2 \quad (8.35)$$

The corresponding high-energy behavior is

$$\sigma_T \quad s \xrightarrow{\sim} \infty \quad s^{2g^2\ln 2/\pi^2} \quad (8.36)$$

and so the Froissart bound is violated.

The fixed-cut is generated by the infinite sum of (5.51) when (6.12) is inserted because as  $n$  increases the average transverse momentum contributing grows. Consequently, for the reasons discussed in sub-Section 6.3, the approximation to the individual production processes given by (6.12) becomes increasingly worse with increasing  $n$  (that is at large transverse momentum the amplitudes summed are down by powers of the sub-energy from the leading behavior). In effect an infinite sum of production processes with individually small amplitudes produces a violation of unitarity.

It is often proposed that (8.36) be used as a starting-point for a study of the Pomeron in QCD by, for example, coupling the series of reggeon diagrams to some specifically chosen  $I = 0$  external states, such as a heavy quark pair coupling to a photon[16]. The couplings for such states will, because of gauge-invariance, contain zeroes which remove the remaining infra-red divergences in  $T^0$ . The fixed-cut (8.35) can be argued[14] to become an accumulation of Regge poles if asymptotic freedom and the running of the gauge coupling are incorporated. As we discussed in the Introduction, this might be a legitimate way to study the so-called “hard Pomeron” corrections to short-distance perturbative  $QCD$ [14, 15, 16, 17]. As a matter of principle, however, the amplitudes obtained can not represent the physical or “soft” Pomeron in a confining gauge theory. Although they are infra-red finite, they remain *singular at zero transverse momentum because of the persistence of gluon reggeon intermediate states*. Equivalently, the zero of (8.11) is sufficient to remove divergences but not to produce amplitudes which are analytic at zero transverse momentum - as should be the case for a confining theory with *no massless particles*.

There is an even more serious problem with using (8.36) as a starting-point for studying the Pomeron. The iteration of the higher-order kernels  $K_N^0$  will generate further branch-points in the  $E$ -plane at  $E \sim -g^2 N$  which produce stronger and stronger violations of the

Froissart bound. [In SU(3) gauge theory this includes odd-signature, “Odderon”, branch-points with[14] higher intercepts than the Pomeron!!] Clearly this singularity structure bears no resemblance to the multiperipheral Pomeron discussed in Part I which evolved phenomenologically over the years and was the basis of the Reggeon Field Theory. Indeed our whole development of multi-Regge theory as a technology for controlling the low transverse momentum unitarity properties of the Pomeron would be useless if the Pomeron in QCD is really the ultra-violet dominated multi-singularity object suggested by the present discussion.

In our opinion the reason for the emergence of this unwelcome structure is that the construction ignores the requirement of complementarity that we must impose a transverse momentum cut-off to reach a confining gauge theory in the limit  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$ . We have already noted that the reggeon diagram formalism itself contains this same message in that the multi-Regge production amplitudes involved are extremely small at large transverse momentum and are down by powers of the energy with respect to neglected amplitudes. Therefore if no transverse momentum cut-off is imposed the multi-Regge amplitudes do not represent a sensible first approximation to the production processes they describe. We emphasize, therefore, that *the “Lipatov Pomeron” is produced* (in a spontaneously-broken gauge theory) *by summing a very large number of very small amplitudes in regions of phase-space where they make no physical sense as an approximation.* Reggeon diagrams are a sensible formalism only at small transverse momenta!

As we noted in the last Section, complementarity further implies that, if we do keep a transverse cut-off, then the states of the theory should be *selected* by the infra-red divergence structure. At this stage our infra-red analysis actually implies that we have no justification for considering *only* bound-state amplitudes in that gluon (and quark) particle amplitudes are actually infinite with respect to such amplitudes. Indeed we do not yet have a sensible limit for reggeon diagram amplitudes in general. Clearly what we would like to understand is how the low transverse momentum regions where the reggeon diagram formalism makes sense can dominate the physics and yet not lead to unphysical divergences. In the next Section we shall argue that the presence of massless quarks is a vital ingredient for this to happen.

## 9. MASSLESS FERMIONS IN REGGEON DIAGRAMS

As we described in Section 4, all fermions (quarks) lie on Regge trajectories in a spontaneously broken gauge theory. The reggeization of the electron in (massive) QED has also been demonstrated[40] up to very high-order in the leading log approximation and the next-to-leading order modification of the trajectory function (6.30) has even been calculated[24].

### 9.1 Quark Reggeons

Much of the formalism for gluon reggeons described in the last two Sections has also been developed for quark reggeons. There is an extensive treatment in [26] in particular. The reggeization can again be derived as the outcome of a multiperipheral equation as illustrated in Fig. 9.1. That is, the multi-Regge production of quarks and gluons, with both quarks and gluons reggeized, self-consistently produces the reggeization of the quarks. (Of course, in massive QED the photons are not reggeized.) The set of gluon and quark production amplitudes represented in Fig. 9.1 is part of the complete set of leading-log multi Regge pole amplitudes defined as follows.

Consider a specific non-abelian gauge theory in which all gluons are massive (from the Higgs mechanism) and all quarks are also (initially) massive. We then consider the complete set of multi-Regge limits defined by Toller diagrams as in Part I. The leading-log result for such amplitudes will be zero unless all t-channels carry either gluon or quark quantum numbers. For the non-zero amplitudes the result will correspondingly be reggeized gluon or quark exchange in each such t-channel. A generalization of the multiperipheral bootstrap illustrated in Fig. 9.1 implies that when these amplitudes are inserted into the direct-channel unitarity equations, in the form of the asymptotic dispersion relations described in Part I, then the leading-log approximation will be self-consistently reproduced for the non-zero amplitudes.

The trajectory function for a reggeized quark differs from that of the electron only by a group-theoretic factor, that is  $\alpha(q^2) = \frac{1}{2} + \Delta(q^2)$  where

$$\Delta(\underline{q}^2) = (\underline{q} - m) G \frac{g^2}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k}}{(\underline{k} - m) \left( (\underline{q} - \underline{k})^2 + M^2 \right)} \quad (9.1)$$

and for SU(N) gauge theory

$$G = (N^2 - 1) / 2N \quad (9.2)$$

Reggeon diagrams containing reggeized quarks will involve the propagator

$$\mathbb{V}(E, \underline{q}) = \frac{1}{(\underline{q} - m)} \frac{1}{\left(E - \frac{1}{2} - \Delta(\underline{q}^2)\right)} \quad (9.3)$$

Note that

$$\Delta(\underline{q}^2) \xrightarrow{m \rightarrow 0} \frac{g^2 G}{(2\pi)^3} \underline{q} \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k}}{\underline{k}((q - k)^2 + M^2)} \quad (9.4)$$

which is finite. Therefore quarks remain reggeized as the massless limit is taken (with all gluons still massive). In general the massless quark limit is smooth and does not disrupt the basic Regge properties of the theory.

The insertion of the leading-log multi Regge pole amplitudes into the unitarity equation (via the asymptotic dispersion relations) also generates next-to-leading log approximations for amplitudes that are zero in the leading-log approximation. In many cases these amplitudes will contain Regge cut contributions involving quark-reggeons. For example, quark-gluon Regge cuts will be generated in channels involving quark quantum number exchange, as illustrated in Fig. 9.2, but with *opposite* signature to the quark reggeon.

The exchange of two reggeized quarks (or a quark/anti-quark pair) produces a Regge cut at

$$E = 1 + 2\Delta(\underline{q}^2/4) \quad (9.5)$$

Therefore amplitudes involving this exchange will be down by a full power of the energy involved compared to those involving gluon exchange. Consequently two quark exchange can, in general, be isolated in a well-defined way only in those channels where a flavor quantum number precludes gluon exchange. In such a channel there will be a multiperipheral equation[46], of the form illustrated in Fig. 9.3, with a reggeon interaction  $R^Q$  generated by the two reggeized quark/gluon vertex. This vertex has the form (in the notation of Fig. 9.4)

$$\Gamma_\mu = \tilde{G} \left[ \gamma^\mu - (m - \underline{k}_1) \frac{P_B^\mu}{k_2 \cdot P_A} - (m - \underline{k}_2) \frac{P_A^\mu}{k_1 \cdot P_B} \right] \quad (9.6)$$

The resulting  $R^Q$  has two distinct components

$$R^Q = R_0^Q + \tilde{R}^Q \quad (9.7)$$



where  $R_0^Q$  results from the product of  $\gamma^\mu$  factors in (9.6) and  $\tilde{R}^Q$  has a similar structure to the gluon vertex  $V(q, k_1, k_2)$ , that is - in the notation of Fig. 9.5

$$\tilde{R}^Q \sim \frac{(\underline{k}_1 + m)(\underline{q} - \underline{k}_2 + m) + (\underline{q} - \underline{k}_1 + m)(\underline{k}_2 + m)}{(\underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2)^2 + M^2} \quad (9.8)$$

Infra-red divergences due to the denominator in (9.8) are cancelled in the limit  $M^2 \rightarrow 0$  by analogous trajectory function divergences *if and only if* the quark/antiquark state carries zero color ( $I = 0$ ).  $R_0^Q$  is an infra-red finite four (reggeized) quark vertex which will play an important role in the following. Consider first the series of diagrams produced by iterating  $R^Q$  through the multiperipheral equation of Fig. 9.3. The resulting transverse momentum integrals are (just) divergent if we include the logarithmic large  $k^2$  behavior of the trajectory function  $\Delta(k^2)$  in the denominator of the quark reggeon propagator. If this denominator is expanded out and the contribution of  $\Delta(k^2)$  combined with the singular part of the kernel to produce an  $I = 0$  infra-red finite kernel as we did for the gluon interaction, then this kernel will be dominated by  $R_0^Q$  at large transverse momentum. The iteration of the kernel through the equation of Fig. 9.3 then produces a series containing *ultra-violet* divergent transverse momentum integrals of the form

$$\int d^2 \underline{k} \ \gamma_\mu(\underline{k})^{-1} \ \gamma_\mu(\underline{k})^{-1} \quad (9.9)$$

$$\sim \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k}}{\underline{k}^2} \quad (9.10)$$

This divergence potentially produces an additional  $\log s$  with each iteration of the multiperipheral equation (the well-known ‘double-logs’ for fermion-antifermion channels). The divergence is *not* eliminated by taking only the ‘leading threshold’ behavior in analogy with the example discussed in Section 5. It *is removed* by including the ultra-violet running of an asymptotically-free gauge coupling. In contrast to the  $I = 0$  gluon channels[41] the infrared finiteness of quark/antiquark reggeon diagrams does allow a running gauge coupling to be legitimately introduced to eliminate the divergence (9.10) and, as we shall discuss further later, bound-states directly related to the quark/antiquark Regge cut generated. To avoid the “non-Regge” behavior generated by (9.10), at the stage when we do not have asymptotic freedom, it is clearly imperative that we keep a transverse momentum cut-off (or

equivalently - keep a non-zero  $\alpha'$  in the quark reggeon propagator). The need for a transverse momentum cut-off is therefore apparent at an even earlier stage than we encountered it in the pure gluon case.

Because of (9.5), quark loops have no influence on the reggeized gluon channels at either the leading or next-to-leading log level. At sufficiently non-leading log level they will contribute to reggeized gluon interaction vertices. However, such contributions are difficult to isolate unless there are distinctive quantum numbers involved. At first sight this seems to be a problem for our general purpose. We wish to include quark loop effects in our analysis, but this will be difficult if we can not describe and manipulate such vertices within the framework of “Analytic Multi-Regge Theory”. That is if they can not be written in terms of gauge-invariant transverse momentum (or reggeon) diagrams which are built from basic reggeon interaction vertices. This requirement is necessary, firstly to implement a transverse momentum cut-off consistently, and secondly so that we can build up the complete set of diagrams using the general formalism of Part I. Indeed, as we have already implied, we ultimately wish to argue that Regge region quarks contribute to the infrared structure of reggeized gluon vertices in a manner which critically modifies the analysis of the last Section.

Before discussing quark loop contributions to gluon vertices in detail it will be instructive to briefly review the contribution of electron loops to high-energy (massive) QED. In this case there are well-defined leading-log contributions but they do *not* satisfy our requirements. We shall find that there is a *non-abelian* component of a quark loop which can be isolated as we want and is essential for our purpose.

## 9.2 The Tower Diagrams in QED

Since the photon has no self-interaction the “leading-log” diagrams in the vacuum exchange channel of QED necessarily involve electron loops. The ‘tower-diagrams’ in Fig. 9.6 involve photon pairs coupled by the (minimal) gauge-invariant set of electron loop diagrams shown. Each photon pair exchange produces a factor of  $l n s$  (apart from the first pair) together with a transverse momentum integral. The result is[47] the set of transverse momentum diagrams shown in Fig. 9.7, with the electron loops producing the four-photon interaction

$$\hat{V}(\underline{k}_1, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q}) = \int d^2 \underline{p} \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{x(\underline{p} + \underline{q} + \underline{k}_1)^2 + (1-x)\underline{p}^2 + m^2}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \times \left\{ \frac{(\underline{p}^2 + m^2) \text{Tr} \left[ (\underline{p} - \underline{q} + \underline{k}_1 + m)(-\underline{p} - \underline{q} - \underline{k}_1 + m) \right]}{x(\underline{p} - \underline{q} + \underline{k}_1)^2 + (1-x)\underline{p}^2 + m^2} \right. \\ & \left. - \text{Tr} \frac{\left[ (-\underline{p} - \underline{q} - \underline{k}_1 + m)(-\underline{k}_2 + \underline{k}_1 + \underline{p} + m)(-\underline{q} + \underline{k}_2 - \underline{p} + m)(\underline{p} + m) \right]}{(1-x)(\underline{p} + \underline{q} - \underline{k}_2)^2 + x(\underline{p} + \underline{k}_1 - \underline{k}_2)^2 + m^2} \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (9.11)$$

From our perspective, there are a number of points of principle involved in the derivation of this interaction. First we note that the  $x$ -integration is over the relative magnitude of the light-cone momenta of the electrons in the loop. Consequently *the Regge region for electron exchange does not contribute distinctively*. There is also a vital subtraction[47] that has to be made to obtain (9.11) via the light-cone procedure outlined in Section 5. The subtraction is necessary if the full four-photon amplitude produced by the sum of the electron loop diagrams is to satisfy the Ward Identity that we discussed in the last Section for the four-gluon amplitude. The subtraction is made by introducing a four-photon vertex defined as (minus) the four-photon amplitude at zero momentum and is equivalent to Pauli-Villars regularization of the ultra-violet region of the electron (Feynman) diagrams. The resulting Ward Identity leads directly to the following property of (9.11), that is

$$\hat{V}(\pm \underline{q}, \underline{k}_2, \underline{q}) = \hat{V}(\underline{k}_1, \pm \underline{q}, \underline{q}) = 0 \quad (9.12)$$

This is the same as the property (8.10) satisfied by the four-gluon vertex  $R_{2,2}^I$ . That is  $\hat{V}$  shares with  $R_{2,2}^I$  the zero structure that we have identified as playing a major role in the non-inversion (or non-exponentiation) of remaining infrared divergences.  $\hat{V}$  also has essentially the same scale-invariance properties as the gluon kernel described in sub-Section 8.5. Indeed it is well-known that the iteration of  $\hat{V}$  via the transverse momentum diagrams of Fig. 9.7 produces a fixed branch-point in the angular momentum plane very similar to (8.33) and similarly violates the Froissart bound.

The violation of the Froissart bound by massive QED is probably more fundamental than the corresponding non-abelian result. For the non-abelian case we shall eventually find high-energy behavior consistent with unitarity after we have understood the origin of confinement in the infrared singularities of the theory. This possibility is not available for the abelian theory and the violation of unitarity is probably directly coupled to the inconsistency of the theory at short distances and to the related non-reggeization of the photon.

### 9.3 Quark Loops in a Non-Abelian Theory

There will surely be a quark-loop contribution to the four reggeized-gluon vertex which is very similar to (9.11). However, as we have discussed, it will be buried in non-leading contributions and not distinctively isolated. If it is derived from the appropriate Feynman diagrams in analogy with the QED derivation of Cheng and Wu[47] then it will have the properties described above and so will not significantly modify the properties of  $R_{2,2}^0$ . We must emphasize, however, the point of principle already alluded to. We have argued consistently throughout this article that we want to study infrared behavior in the presence of a transverse momentum cut-off. It is clear that since (9.12) results from a subtraction procedure at large momentum, it is potentially in conflict with the imposition of any such cut-off. If we explicitly needed the non-abelian analog of (9.11) in our analysis then whether or not there was such a conflict would be a major issue that we would have to resolve. Fortunately this is not the case, a non-abelian gauge theory has additional structure which resolves the matter.

In SU(2) gauge theory there is, in particular, a next-to-leading log contribution to  $R_{2,2}^0$  which is well-defined in terms of quark transverse momentum diagrams. We shall find this contribution first by examining Feynman diagram contributions that might be involved. We shall then describe how the vertex can be constructed from the general reggeon diagram construction procedure outlined at the end of Section 6. This will lead us to understand some key general properties and principles that are involved.

Consider first the two-reggeon cut in the quark/antiquark exchange channel of a four gluon reggeon amplitude as illustrated in Fig. 9.8. As a reggeon singularity the quark/antiquark state carries *odd* signature and can carry both  $I = 0$  and  $I = 1$ , even if we require  $I = 0$  in the overall  $t$ -channel. (A property that potentially distinguishes it from *any odd-signature gluon contribution*). However, the vertex for gluon  $\rightarrow$  gluon + quark/antiquark pair through which it couples is necessarily a nonsense vertex (that is odd signature  $\rightarrow$  odd signature + odd signature) and so could not appear as a reggeon vertex in signature-conserving reggeon diagrams describing elastic scattering. Therefore, Fig. 9.8 is well-defined as a component of a *reggeon* diagram only in multiparticle amplitudes. Nevertheless, in analogy with our discussion in Section 6 of both the gluon reggeon loop contribution to reggeization and gluon reggeon exchange in the four reggeon vertex, we can ask whether Fig. 9.8 can contribute in elastic scattering as a transverse momentum threshold diagram. That is while a nonsense-

zero will cancel the quark/antiquark reggeon propagator in reggeon diagrams, the presence of non-abelian group-factors can potentially produce an “*even signature*” *nonsense-state threshold* in the four reggeized gluon vertex. The need for the group factors to contribute determines that only the  $I = 1$  component will be involved.

To find potential Feynman diagrams that might contribute we note that the lowest-order contribution to the gluon  $\rightarrow$  gluon + quark/antiquark vertex is a single quark intermediate state. Therefore the simplest reggeon diagram that could contribute is that shown in Fig. 9.9. The simplest candidate Feynman diagram contributing to this reggeon diagram is then the planar diagram of Fig. 9.10. However, if we consider the spin structure of the transverse momentum diagram generated we find that the diagram of Fig. 9.10 can not actually contribute.

In analogy with the numerator contribution (5.26) to Fig. 5.6, the left-side gluons of Fig. 9.10 will give a  $\gamma^-$  (say) coupling to the quark loop, while those on the right-side will give a  $\gamma^+$  coupling. Thus, in the notation shown, the numerator for the quark loop of Fig. 9.10 will be

$$Tr \left[ \gamma^-(\underline{q} + \underline{p} + m) \gamma^+(\underline{p} - \underline{k}_2 + m) \gamma^+(\underline{p} - \underline{q} + m) \gamma^-(\underline{p} - \underline{k}_1 + m) \right] \quad (9.13)$$

$$= 0 \quad (9.14)$$

since one of the  $\gamma^+$ 's (or the  $\gamma^-$ 's) can clearly be commuted through a transverse numerator to annihilate against the other.

#### 9.4 The Four Gluon Reggeon Vertex

To obtain a non-zero contribution to the reggeon diagram of Fig. 9.8 we must consider a non-planar Feynman diagram involving the quark loop of Fig. 9.11. The alternation of  $\gamma^+$  and  $\gamma^-$  couplings around the loop will avoid the vanishing of (9.14). Utilizing the identity

$$\begin{aligned} & Tr \left[ \gamma^-(\underline{A}_\perp + m) \gamma^+(\underline{B}_\perp + m) \gamma^-(\underline{C}_\perp + m) \gamma^+(\underline{D}_\perp + m) \right] \\ &= 8 Tr \left[ (-\underline{A}_\perp + m)(\underline{B}_\perp + m)(\underline{C}_\perp - m)(\underline{D}_\perp + m) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (9.15)$$

and assuming (for the moment) that the horizontal quark propagators in Fig. 9.11 are removed by the process of reduction to a transverse momentum diagram, we obtain for the

simplest contribution to Fig. 9.8 (in the notation shown)

$$V_D(q, \underline{k}, \underline{k}') \sim I(q, \underline{k}, \underline{k}') \quad (9.16)$$

$$= \int d^2p \frac{\text{Tr} [(-\underline{p} + \underline{q} + m)(\underline{p} + \underline{k} + m)(-\underline{p} + \underline{q} + m)(\underline{p} + \underline{k}' + m)]}{[(p+q)^2 + m^2][(p-q)^2 + m^2]}$$

which is divergent. As in the examples discussed in Sections 5 and 6 we anticipate that the appropriate convergent integral is obtained by keeping only the leading behavior of the numerator at the threshold produced by the denominators. At first sight there is an ambiguity as to how to proceed, since there are a number of identities, analogous to (5.28), that we can exploit. We can use any of

$$(-\underline{p} + \underline{q} + m)(\underline{p} + \underline{k} + m) = (-\underline{p} + \underline{q} + m)(\underline{k} + \underline{q}) + 4[(p-q)^2 + m^2] \quad (9.17)$$

$$(\underline{p} + \underline{k} + m)(-\underline{p} - \underline{q} + m) = (\underline{k} - \underline{q})(-\underline{p} - \underline{q} + m) + 4[(p+q)^2 + m^2] \quad (9.18)$$

$$(-\underline{p} - \underline{q} + m)(\underline{p} + \underline{k}' + m) = (-\underline{p} - \underline{q} + m)(\underline{k}' - \underline{q}) + 4[(p+q)^2 + m^2] \quad (9.19)$$

$$(\underline{p} + \underline{k}' + m)(-\underline{p} + \underline{q} + m) = (\underline{k}' + \underline{q})(-\underline{p} + \underline{q} + m) + 4[(p-q)^2 + m^2] \quad (9.20)$$

Indeed various combinations of (9.17) – (9.20) can be used to extract a convergent integral from (9.16). A symmetric procedure (which we shall shortly argue gives the correct result) is to apply separately (9.17) and (9.18) and then average, and similarly with (9.19) and (9.20). The result is the symmetric and convergent vertex function

$$V_c(q, k, k') \sim \int d^2p \frac{\text{Tr} [(-\underline{p} + \underline{q} + m)\underline{k}(-\underline{p} - \underline{q} + m)\underline{k}']}{[(p+q)^2 + m^2][(p-q)^2 + m^2]} \quad (9.21)$$

We notice first that  $V_c$  is odd under  $k \rightarrow -k$  or under  $k' \rightarrow -k'$ . This reflects the essential odd signature nature of the reggeon diagram in Fig. 9.8. Indeed, in an abelian gauge theory, the insertion of this interaction into an even signature amplitude, for example inserting  $V_c$  to replace  $\hat{V}$  in the transverse momentum diagrams of Fig. 9.7, will give zero just because of this odd signature property. If this were not the case the infra-red divergence structure of  $QED$  would be completely different! There would be a  $t$ -channel iteration of divergences in addition to the  $s$ -channel iteration discussed in Section 7.3. That  $V_c$  does

not contribute in the high-energy transverse momentum diagrams of  $QED$  can, as we noted in the Introduction, be regarded as a confirmation of the cancellation of all anomalous massless fermion effects in the physical S-Matrix of  $QED$ [3]. However, as we have already noted, in a non-abelian theory and in  $SU(2)$  gauge theory in particular, there will be group factors involved. Signature now involves a combination of  $k \rightarrow -k$  (say) together with the conjugation of quark couplings. The presence of an  $I = 1$  component of the quark-antiquark reggeon state then allows the vertex function  $V_c$  to give an *even signature* contribution, as a transverse momentum diagram, to the even-signature reggeized gluon vertex - even though it *does not* contribute as a reggeon diagram because of nonsense zeroes.

$V_c$  is naturally interpreted as follows. First apply (9.18) and (9.19) to obtain a vertex function

$$I^1(q, k, k') = \int d^2p \frac{Tr[(-\not{p} + \not{q} + m)(\not{k} - \not{q})(-\not{p} - \not{q} + m)(\not{k}' - q)]}{[(p+q)^2 + m^2][(p-q)^2 + m^2]} \quad (9.22)$$

which satisfies

$$I^1(q, q, k') = I^1(q, k, q) = 0 \quad (9.23)$$

and so, as we shall discuss below, is naturally associated with a *reggeon* diagram having the form of Fig. 9.11. Using the analogous manipulations, the ‘full’ vertex  $V_c$  can be written as the sum of terms

$$V_c = I^1 + I^2 + I^3 + I^4 \quad (9.24)$$

each of which satisfies an analogous property to (9.25) and is associated with one of the diagrams illustrated in Fig. 9.12.

## 9.5 Reggeon Diagram Origin of the Vertex $V_c$

We consider now how the vertex  $V_c$  would be constructed via the hexagraph loop procedure outlined at the end of Section 6. It is very important that we can, in principle, construct this vertex entirely from multi-Regge amplitudes whose form is unambiguously determined from our general formalism. The reggeon diagram we need to construct is a one-loop amplitude contributing to the hexagraph of Fig. 9.13. For this we take a multiple discontinuity as shown and integrate the two multireggeon diagrams (with signature factors removed by the discontinuities taken) over the appropriate two reggeon phase space. We can similarly construct the corresponding loop contribution to the hexagraph of Fig. 9.14. The two contributions can be combined to give even and odd-signature amplitudes. The

reggeon propagator in the odd-signature amplitude will be cancelled by a nonsense-zero as discussed above, while the  $I = 1$  even-signature amplitude will contain the transverse momentum interaction we want.

The discontinuities shown in Fig. 9.13 do indeed remove the intermediate quark denominator factors that are absent in (9.21) and the corresponding signature factors are not reinstated when the complete diagram is assembled. Thus the construction process removes just the quark particle poles that we assumed should be absent. If there were no particle poles in the amplitudes initially, then taking discontinuities would introduce additional zeroes and we would not obtain the expressions we have given. Therefore it is crucial that the intermediate quark states can be on-shell physical states.

Note also that the nonsense zeroes shown can produce two effects. One is the cancellation of the reggeon propagator for the reggeon state which splits Fig. 9.13 in two. In addition, if evaluated on the Regge poles of the attached quark lines, and the particle pole of the attached gluon line, they will produce a zero at vanishing momentum for the gluon line. It is clearly consistent therefore, that the nonsense-zero structure shows up in lowest order as a product of linear zeroes in two of the gluon momenta together with the absence of the reggeon propagator - just the structure we obtained by associating  $I^1$  with Fig. 9.11 interpreted as a reggeon diagram.

There is a further point of principle arising from the reggeon diagram construction of  $V_c$ . When the full amplitude associated with Fig. 9.13 is constructed by adding signature factors it does not contain particle poles in all gluon reggeon channels. This is discussed at the end of Section 4 of Part I. As a result the four reggeon interaction we extract *does not contribute to the four-gluon scattering amplitude* when all the gluons are taken on shell. This implies that  $V_c$  plays no role in the  $I = 1$  reggeon channel involving the gluon reggeization. Although we shall not elaborate the argument, there is necessarily a cancellation analagous to the cancellation between the diagrams of Fig. 5.12(b) and Fig. 5.13 discussed at the end of Section 5.

## 9.6 Properties of $V_c$

We now describe a number of important properties of  $V_c$ . First we confirm that (9.21) is indeed a convergent integral. For large values of  $p$  the integral for  $V_c$  gives

$$\int \frac{d^2 p}{p^4} \text{Tr} [\not{p} \not{k} \not{p} \not{k}'] = 4 \int \frac{d^2 p}{p^4} [2(k \cdot p)(k' \cdot p) - k \cdot k' p^2] \quad (9.25)$$



$$= kk' \int \frac{d^2 p}{p^2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta [2 \cos \theta \cos(\theta + \phi) - \cos \phi] \quad (9.26)$$

$$= 0 \quad (9.27)$$

where  $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are respectively the angles between  $k$  and  $p$ , and  $k$  and  $k'$ .

Next we consider the limits  $m \rightarrow 0$  followed by  $q \rightarrow 0$ , that is

$$V_c \xrightarrow[m \rightarrow 0]{} \int d^2 p \frac{\text{Tr}[(\not{p} - \not{q})\not{k}(\not{p} + \not{q})\not{k}']}{(p+q)^2(p-q)^2} \quad (9.28)$$

$$\begin{aligned} q \xrightarrow{q \rightarrow 0} & 4 \int \frac{d^2 p}{p^4} [2(p \cdot k)(p \cdot k') - p^2(k \cdot k')] + 0(q^2) \\ & - 4 [2(q \cdot k)(q \cdot k') - q^2(k \cdot k')] \int \frac{d^2 p}{(p+q)^2(p-q)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (9.29)$$

where we have exploited the fact that integrals that are odd with respect to  $p$  vanish. From (9.27) we see that the first integral in (9.29) also vanishes. Utilizing

$$\int \frac{d^2 p}{(p+q)^2(p-q)^2} = \frac{2\pi}{q^2} \quad (9.30)$$

we obtain

$$V_c \xrightarrow[m \rightarrow 0]{q \rightarrow 0} \tilde{V}_c = 8\pi \left[ \frac{2(q \cdot k)(q \cdot k')}{q^2} - k \cdot k' \right] \quad (9.31)$$

Using this last limiting form for  $V_c$  (which clearly originates from the on-shell quark propagators) it follows that the “Ward Identity property” (9.12) is not satisfied. Indeed we obtain the simple result

$$\tilde{V}_c(q, k, k') \xrightarrow{q \rightarrow \pm k, \pm k'} 8\pi(2k \cdot k' - k \cdot k') \quad (9.32)$$

$$= 8\pi k \cdot k' \quad (9.33)$$

The basic reason that we do not obtain (9.12) is clear from the reggeon diagram construction illustrated in Figs. 9.13 and 9.14. The initial gluon is able to couple to two

quark reggeons that can carry the necessary helicities to allow an on-shell non-vanishing coupling.

The elementary form of (9.33) suggests that a simple subtraction might restore the Ward Identity property. A conventional ‘Pauli-Villars’ subtraction of  $V_c$  would involve

$$V_p = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} V_c(q, k, k', ml) = \int d^2p \frac{m^2 \text{Tr} [\not{k} \not{k}']}{(p^2 + m^2)^2} \quad (9.34)$$

$$= 4m^2 k \cdot k' \int_0^\infty \frac{d(p^2)}{(p^2 - m^2)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \quad (9.35)$$

$$= 8\pi k \cdot k' \quad (9.36)$$

Consequently a subtracted vertex  $V_c - V_p$  would, for small  $q$  and  $m$ , satisfy (9.12).

In fact the Ward-Identities and resultant Pauli-Villars subtraction procedure to be imposed, at the Feynman diagram level, on quark loops are much more complicated in a non-abelian theory than in an abelian theory. This is because the existence of an elementary four-gluon vertex implies that the subtraction process mixes strongly with the problem of renormalization. It is therefore very interesting that, in the non-abelian case, we are able to discuss the subject in a self-contained manner in the infrared region of the transverse momentum interaction that we have derived. This simplicity enables us to give a straightforward discussion of the *interplay* that we anticipated earlier, between the transverse momentum cut-off and the subtraction procedure.

## 9.7 Subtraction and the Transverse momentum Cut-Off

We have emphasized that we wish to take the infrared limits giving massless quarks and massless SU(2) gauge fields with a (gauge-invariant) transverse cut-off present in all transverse momentum and reggeon diagrams. It is straightforward to impose this cut-off in the definition of  $V_c$  via (9.21), that is we define

$$V_c^\lambda = \int_{|p|^2 < \lambda} d^2p \frac{\text{Tr} [(-\not{p} + \not{q} + m) \not{k} (-\not{p} - \not{q} + m) \not{k}']}{[(p+q)^2 + m^2][(p-q)^2 + m^2]} \quad (9.37)$$

Since (9.28) holds also with  $|p|^2 < \lambda$  imposed and (9.31) is modified only to

$$\int_{|p|^2 < \lambda} \frac{d^2p}{(p+q)^2(p-q)^2} = \frac{2\pi}{q^2} (1 + 0(q^2/\lambda)) \quad (9.38)$$

we see that

$$V_c^\lambda \xrightarrow[m \rightarrow 0]{q \rightarrow 0} \tilde{V}_c + 0(q^2/\lambda) \quad (9.39)$$

and so the leading infrared behavior of  $V_c^\lambda$  is actually independent of  $\lambda$ .

The Pauli-Villars regularization procedure is, not surprisingly, strongly sensitive to the presence of  $\lambda$ . If we define  $V_p^\lambda$  by imposing  $|p|^2 < \lambda$  in (9.34) we obtain

$$V_p^\lambda = m \lim_{\infty} 4m^2 k \cdot k' \int_0^\lambda \frac{dp^2}{(p^2 + m^2)^2} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta \quad (9.40)$$

$$= m \lim_{\infty} 8\pi k \cdot k' \left[ \frac{\lambda}{\lambda + m^2} \right] \quad (9.41)$$

$$= 0 \quad \lambda \neq \infty \quad (9.42)$$

This shows clearly that if we insist on taking the infrared limits with  $\lambda \neq \infty$  then we can not impose (9.12) on  $V_c$  by a Pauli-Villars subtraction procedure. This is what we would expect on the general grounds that the presence of an ultra-violet cut-off prevents the manipulation of the quark sea at infinite momentum in order to obtain properties of the gluon interaction at zero momentum. From this perspective, it would clearly be undesirable to use a ‘‘Pauli-Villars’’ procedure involving the ‘‘on-shell’’ contribution of infinitely massive reggeized quarks.

We shall see that the failure to impose (9.12) on  $V_c$  ultimately leads to ‘desirable’ rather than ‘undesirable’ consequences. This may be directly related to Gribov’s argument[45] that Ward Identities should not be imposed on fermion loops at too early a stage in the construction of a gauge theory. We now go on to discuss the extension of the infrared analysis of the previous Section in the presence of  $V_c$ .

## 9.8 Infrared Analysis in the Presence of $V_c$

Clearly the most important implication of the previous sub-Section is that if we take the limit of massless quarks in SU(2) gauge theory we will obtain a well-defined contribution,  $V_c$ , to the four reggeon vertex  $R_{2,2}^0$ , which is independent of the cut-off and which satisfies (9.33). That is  $R_{2,2}^0$  now does not vanish when one of the reggeons carries zero transverse momentum. Consequently we anticipate that the infrared divergence of  $T^0$  which, following (8.29), we attributed to the two-reggeon state, will be inverted by reggeon unitarity as in

(8.23) – (8.25). Actually there is a minor complication here. To be completely sure how  $V_c$  contributes to  $R_{2,2}^0$ , we must construct the complete set of reggeon diagrams contributing to elastic scattering of the form illustrated in Fig. 9.15 with the appropriate signature factors. If we follow the procedure outlined at the end of Section 6 we find that the surviving infra-red divergences are as illustrated in Fig. 9.16.

The inversion process eliminates not only the infrared divergences, but also removes the corresponding angular-momentum plane singularity. As a result all contributions of the two-reggeon state are eliminated *with one exception*. Since  $V_c$  does vanish when *all* of its arguments vanish (this can be regarded as a consequence of the overall scaling property of the vertex) the argument for inversion fails for that part of phase-space where both reggeons carry a finite fraction of an overall *vanishing* transverse momentum. To give a finite contribution such a region must produce a further divergence.

As we noted above, the fundamental reason that  $V_c(q, k, k')$  does not vanish with individual gluon transverse momenta, is that a massless physical gluon has a non-zero amplitude for transition into a massless quark/antiquark pair. This leads to a non-zero amplitude for the exchange of a quark/antiquark pair as an interaction between reggeized gluons. Even color-zero gluon reggeon states are unstable in the presence of this interaction. Indeed it follows from (5.22)-(5.25) that we could equally well replace each of the gluons coupling via  $V_c$  by a general number of gluons. This would give contributions to  $R_{N,N}^0$  (the  $N \rightarrow N$  reggeized gluon vertex) having the general form illustrated in Fig. 9.17. In general such interactions will prevent the vanishing of  $R_{N,N}^0$  when any subset of the transverse momenta involved vanish. This is sufficient to ensure that all infra-red divergences of the  $N$ -reggeon state associated with such configurations are inverted in  $T^0$ . Again, the only part of the  $N$ -reggeon state which might survive is that where *all reggeons carry a finite fraction of an overall vanishing transverse momentum* and participate in a further infra-red divergence.

## 9.9 Infrared Scale Invariance Divergences

We have now eliminated almost all infra-red divergences (and almost all contributions of reggeized gluons in the process). However, as we now discuss, there is a particular class of zero transverse momentum gluon configurations that we have not yet eliminated and which produce infrared divergences which are directly related to the *scale-invariance properties of the color-zero kernels  $\tilde{K}_N^0$* .

We have noted, in (8.32) and (8.33), the ultra-violet divergence of the massive kernels  $K_N^0$  due to the scale-invariance of the massless kernels  $\tilde{K}_N^0$ . This scale-invariance property is also a potential source of infrared divergences in the massless theory since

$$\int_{|k_i|^2, |k'_j|^2 < \lambda} \prod_i \frac{d^2 k_i}{k_i^2} \prod_j \frac{d^2 k'_j}{k_j'^2} \tilde{K}_N(k_1, \dots, k_N, k'_1, \dots, k'_N) \quad (9.43)$$

$$\sim \int_0^\lambda \frac{dk^2}{k^2} \quad ; \quad k^2 = k_1^2 + \dots + k_N^2 + \dots + k_N'^2 \quad (9.44)$$

$$\sim \infty \sim \ln M^2 \quad (?) \quad (9.45)$$

The physical significance of this infrared divergence is entirely different to that of the ultra-violet divergence, as we now discuss.

We have already noted that the scale-invariance property of  $\tilde{K}_N^0$  is not destroyed by the addition of the  $V_c$  interaction. The additional inversion of infrared divergences produced by this interaction does, however, ensure that there are no divergences as any subset of the momenta in (9.43) go to zero. The *overall* divergence as all momenta scale uniformly to zero will not be eliminated - precisely because it is a direct consequence of scale-invariance. The question we now consider is whether this behavior is actually associated with any  $\log M^2$  divergences, as the gluon mass  $M \rightarrow 0$ , in physical amplitudes.

The divergence (9.45) will appear in all color-zero  $N$ -gluon channels for elastic scattering amplitudes. However, in this case it can only occur when the total transverse momentum  $q$  vanishes and so can only produce a  $\log q^2$  divergence, *not a  $\log M^2$  divergence*. However, our previous discussion has already shown that all finite  $q^2$  amplitudes are eliminated by inversion of divergences.

A divergence of the form (9.45) could occur in amplitudes of the form illustrated in Fig. 9.18. That is an  $I = 0$  configuration of gluons is exchanged accompanying an  $I = 0$  quark/antiquark pair. As we noted in sub-Section 9.1 the quark/antiquark channel is infrared finite as the gluon mass  $M \rightarrow 0$ . Indeed, because of the ultra-violet divergences associated with  $R_0^Q$ , the dynamics of this channel will be dominated by finite  $q^2$ . The infrared divergence of the accompanying gluons will not mix with the quark/antiquark channel and the divergence (9.45) will occur as illustrated in Fig. 9.18.

Given the discussion of the last Section we anticipate that reggeon unitarity will

invert this last divergence via the sequence of diagrams shown in Fig. 9.19. As illustrated in Fig. 9.20, the necessary interaction for this iteration will be provided by a generalization of the gluon vertices of the form of Fig. 9.17, that is the reggeized gluons interact with the reggeized quarks by the exchange of quark/antiquark pairs. Interactions of the form of Fig. 9.20 will indeed invert the divergence in Fig. 9.19 unless the coupling of the gluons and quarks shown *either does not exist, or vanishes at zero transverse momentum*. To discuss this possibility we must consider in detail the *color charge parity* of multigluon states.

## 9.10 Color Charge Parity and Signature

We have so far denoted multi-reggeon states only by their total color  $I$ . There has also been a simple relationship between  $I$  and signature. That is multi-gluon configurations with color  $I$  have signature  $(-1)^I$ . However, as we go beyond the next-to-leading log approximation this correspondence is not obviously maintained. In particular an odd-signature three-reggeon configuration with  $I = 0$  can apparently be formed. If  $A^i (i = 1, 2, 3, \dots)$  denotes the components of the color matrix of the gluon field, then the *Odderon* configuration

$$0 \equiv \text{Tr} [\epsilon_{ijk} A^i A^j A^k] \quad (9.46)$$

has  $I = 0$ . The question is whether there is indeed a three-reggeon singularity associated with this configuration. If there is, we know from the general signature rules for Regge cuts that it must have *odd-signature* and so violate the  $(-1)^I$  rule. Note that this is not the three-gluon Odderon studied in *QCD*[14]. As we now describe, unlike the *QCD* Odderon, the configuration (9.46) has anomalous *color-charge parity*.

For gauge fields with color matrix  $A_{\alpha\beta}^i$  the *charge conjugation* operation  $C$  is defined by

$$C A_{\alpha\beta}^i C^{-1} = -A_{\beta\alpha}^i \quad (9.47)$$

The additional transposition of the color matrix generalizes the sign change involved in the charge conjugation of the photon field. The gauge field part of the lagrangian is invariant if (9.47) is combined with a change of sign of the gauge coupling. We can also define  $C$  for the global  $\text{SU}(2)$  symmetry of the spontaneously broken lagrangian (7.4) where it can be extended as a color-charge parity operation analogous to conventional G-parity. In this case the signature-rule  $(-1)^I$  simply says that the signature of a reggeon state is given by its color-charge parity. (We have already noted that the color factors of the global symmetry do

become the gauge symmetry color factors for Feynman diagrams when the gauge symmetry is restored). We now show that this signature rule is a simple consequence of the helicity-conservation property of a gauge theory.

### 9.11 Signature and $T, C, P$ Properties

In Part I we defined signature analytically by the process of *twisting* hexagraphs (or planar Toller diagrams) and adding or subtracting corresponding spectral component contributions. An equivalent “group-theoretic” definition, which is particularly simple for elastic scattering, is as follows.

Consider the ‘direct channel’ (defined by (2.46) of Part I) corresponding to a particular planar Toller diagram for the amplitude under discussion. Consider the *full scattering amplitude* in this channel. We define signature by *adding the TCP transformation*  $\tau$  to the  $SO(2,1)$  little group defined for each line of the Toller diagram. For the  $i$ -th line,  $\tau_i$  is defined as making a complete *TCP* transformation on all particles attached (through the diagram) to one of the two vertices (say the left) which the  $i$ -line connects.  $\tau_i$  can then be applied directly to the planar Toller diagram and a new direct channel obtained. The amplitude with signature  $\tau_i = +1$  ( $-1$ ) is defined by adding (subtracting) the *full amplitude* for the new physical process to (from) the original full amplitude. (Since all amplitudes are invariant under a full *TCP* transformation of all particles it does not, of course, matter whether the right or the left vertex of the  $i$ -th line is used in this definition.)

Repeating the process for each channel defines amplitudes

$$M_N^{(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_{N-3})}(t_1, \dots, t_{N-3}, g_1, \dots, g_{N-3}) \quad (9.48)$$

Regge singularities with definite signature  $\tau$  then appear in a particular  $t_i$ -channel only in amplitudes with  $\tau_i = \tau$ .

For elastic scattering this definition of signature implies we add or subtract amplitudes as illustrated in Fig. 9.21. For a reggeon state to appear, the coupling to external states must be correspondingly even or odd under the *TCP* transformation as illustrated in Fig. 9.22. Since the combination *TP* simply transforms an ingoing (outgoing) particle to an outgoing (ingoing) particle with the same helicity, it follows that if reggeized gluon couplings are *helicity conserving* then the contribution of a reggeized gluon state to an elastic amplitude

at zero momentum transfer must satisfy

$$\tau = TCP = C \quad (9.49)$$

which is the signature rule we have discussed. The odderon configuration (9.46) is *anomalous* in that it *does not satisfy* (9.49).

The helicity conservation property leading to (9.49) is, as we have emphasized, present in all leading and next-to-leading log calculations. For quark scattering this will not be the case beyond this approximation if the quarks are massive. However, if we take the massless limit as discussed earlier in this Section, then the helicity conservation property becomes absolute in perturbation theory. Therefore, a reggeized gluon state with the quantum numbers of (9.46) can not appear in forward quark scattering amplitudes ( $T^0$ ) in the limit of zero quark mass.

Consider now whether the Odderon configuration (9.46) can couple in an amplitude of the form of Fig. 9.18, that is accompanying a quark/antiquark state. We anticipate that helicity conservation (at zero quark mass) will prevent this configuration from coupling to such a state via a reggeon interaction at zero transverse momentum. Therefore we expect that if an infra-red divergence of the form (9.46) does occur *it will not be simply iterated by an interaction of the form of Fig. 9.20*. The vital question then becomes whether the Odderon can couple initially or finally to *any* physical state! We shall require the triangle anomaly analysis of the next Section to answer this.

## 9.12 Confinement and Chiral Symmetry Breaking in SU(2) Gauge Theory

We can finally provide a glimpse of how a sensible confinement spectrum may emerge out of our analysis. First we note that a single quark (or antiquark) state is not an eigenstate of either  $C$  or  $P$ , but quark/antiquark states can be. Indeed the quark/antiquark reggeon state with trajectory (9.5), which appears in Figs. 9.18 - 9.20 accompanied by gluons, can carry both  $C = +1$  and  $C = -1$ . It must be a ‘nonsense’ state with

$$j \sim |n_1 - n_2| - 1 \sim 0 \quad (9.50)$$

but both  $n_1 \sim -n_2 \sim \frac{1}{2}$  and  $n_1 \sim -n_2 \sim -\frac{1}{2}$  are possible. The even and odd combinations of these states will have  $P = -1$  and  $P = +1$  respectively, giving both “vector” and “axial-vector” nonsense states.



We clearly have a “confinement” spectrum in the sense that all states with  $I$  non-zero have been exponentiated (inverted) out of the theory by infra-red divergences. We have briefly noted that the infra-red finite, *odd signature*,  $I = 0$ , quark/antiquark reggeon states (9.50) can be converted to “bound-state” Regge poles via the “ultra-violet” interaction  $R_0^Q$ . If an anomalous  $I = 0$  set of gluons is also present then an *even signature* reggeon state capable of producing a spin-zero physical particle will be generated. Therefore, if the normal parity “vector” quark/antiquark state is somehow “selected” by the anomalous gluon configuration then the complete state (involving the anomalous gluons) will have abnormal parity. (This selection is just what we shall argue is achieved by the anomalous interactions discussed in the next Section.) Therefore it seems that the scaling infra-red divergence of the Odderon configuration can create the correct physical spectrum of *pseudo-scalar* Goldstone bosons for a confining, chiral symmetry breaking, solution of the theory. Before we can study this more explicitly we must understand just how the anomalous gluon state can couple to quark reggeon states.

## 10. THE TRIPLE-REGGE VERTEX AND THE TRIANGLE ANOMALY

In the previous Section we raised the possibility that an “anomalous Odderon” three-gluon state could produce an infra-red divergence of the form (9.45). However, as we have discussed, because of helicity-conservation this state will normally *not couple* at zero  $Q^2$  - where the infra-red divergence is generated. ( $Q$  now denotes the overall transverse momentum of the Odderon state). We can restate this property by noting that if (9.49) is not satisfied then the reggeon coupling (to the external states involved) must be odd under  $TP$ . That is, if helicity conservation is maintained, the coupling must be linear in  $Q$  and so must vanish at  $Q = 0$  *unless it has singular  $Q$ -dependence - odd under  $Q \rightarrow -Q$* . Alternatively (or as we shall find equivalently) we must find a singularity which violates helicity conservation. We must consider, therefore, whether such singular dependence can arise from quark (reggeon) loop interactions?

We have already shown that the quark/antiquark threshold in reggeon diagrams can produce *finite* (reggeized) gluon interactions at zero momentum transfer. To obtain more singular dependence we must locate a singularity involving *three* quark propagators in a transverse momentum diagram - that is a *triangle* singularity. To this end we consider whether a configuration of the form illustrated in Fig. 10.1 could produce a singular coupling for the anomalous gluon state. To do this we shall have to review some properties of the general triple-regge vertex which were not covered in sufficient detail for our present purposes in Part I.

### 10.1 General Structure of the Triple-Regge Vertex

We consider the Toller diagram shown in Fig. 10.2 (cf. Fig. 2.2 in Part I). The appropriate variables are as illustrated. The corresponding Sommerfeld-Watson (SW) representation is constructed by writing the sum of hexagraphs shown in Fig. 10.3. Each hexagraph corresponds to a set of allowable (asymptotically distinct) triple discontinuities. For the first hexagraph in Fig. 10.3, the set of triple discontinuities is as shown in Figs. 10.4 and 10.5. The SW representation is obtained by starting with the partial-wave expansion

$$A_6^H(z_1, z_2, z_3, w_2, w_3) = \sum T_{\ell_1} D_{\ell_2} D_{\ell_3} a_{\underline{\ell} \underline{n}} \quad (10.1)$$

$$= \sum d_{0,n_2+n_3}^{\ell_1}(z_1) d_{n_2,0}^{\ell_2}(z_2) d_{n_3,0}^{\ell_3}(z_3) u_2^{n_2} u_3^{n_3} a_{\underline{\ell}, \underline{n}} \quad (10.2)$$

(The notation here is the same as in Section 4 of Part I)

It will be useful to first distinguish the triple-regge and helicity-pole limits associated with Fig. 10.2. The triple-regge limit is

$$z_1, z_2, z_3 \rightarrow \infty \quad (10.3)$$

while there are two distinct helicity-pole limits. The first is

$$z_1, u_2, u_3 \rightarrow \infty \text{ (or } u_2, u_3 \rightarrow 0) \quad (10.4)$$

and the second is

$$z_1, u_2, u_3^{-1} \rightarrow \infty \text{ (or } u_2, u_3^{-1} \rightarrow 0) \quad (10.5)$$

The following approximations are (essentially) uniformly valid in all three limits

$$s_{23} \sim z_1 z_2 (u_2 + 1/u_2) \quad (10.6)$$

$$s_{234} \sim z_1 \quad (10.7)$$

$$s_{25} \sim s_{16} \sim z_1 z_3 (u_3 + 1/u_3) \quad (10.8)$$

$$-s_{45} \sim s_{35} \sim z_2 z_3 (u_2/u_3 + u_3/u_2) \quad (10.9)$$

$$s_{235} \sim s_{23} + s_{25} + s_{23} \quad (10.10)$$

The triple discontinuity corresponding to Fig. 10.4 is in

$$s_{23}, \quad s_{16}, \quad s_{234} \quad (10.11)$$

From (10.6) - (10.8) we see that (asymptotically) powers of these invariants will contribute to partial waves with

$$n_2, n_3 \geq 0, \quad \ell_1 \geq n_2 + n_3 \quad (10.12)$$

Correspondingly a Froissart-Gribov (FG) continuation can be made to complex  $n_2, n_3$  and  $\ell_1 - n_2 - n_3$ . The part of (10.2) satisfying (10.12) can then be SW transformed and an asymptotic representation valid in the limits (10.3) and (10.4) obtained. Since  $s_{23}$  and  $s_{16}$  are functions of  $\cos \omega_2$  (  $= (u_1 + \frac{1}{u_1})/2$ ) and  $\cos \omega_3$  respectively, the same asymptotic

behavior holds in the limit (10.5) and indeed an equivalent asymptotic representation would be obtained if  $n_2, n_3 \geq 0$  in (10.12) is replaced by any combination of  $\pm n_2 \geq 0$  and  $\pm n_3 \geq 0$ .

The cuts represented by Fig. 10.5(a) are in

$$s_{23}, \quad s_{16}, \quad s_{45} \tag{10.13}$$

while the cuts represented by Fig. 10.5(b) are in

$$s_{23}, \quad s_{16}, \quad s_{235} \tag{10.14}$$

From (10.9) and (10.10) we see that asymptotically the  $s_{235}$  and  $s_{45}$  cuts can be treated as (right and left) cuts in the same variable. (10.13) [or (10.14)] appear as three asymptotically distinct cuts only in the Regge limit (10.3) and the helicity-pole limit (10.5). The resulting partial-waves satisfy

$$\begin{aligned} n_2 \geq 0, \quad n_3 \leq 0, \quad \tilde{\ell}_1 \geq n_2 - n_3 \\ \text{or} \\ n_2 \leq 0, \quad n_3 \geq 0, \quad \tilde{\ell}_1 \geq n_3 - n_2 \end{aligned} \tag{10.15}$$

and the SW representation is correspondingly obtained from that part of the sum in (10.2).

The combination of cuts (10.13) actually appears in each of the first three hexagraphs in Fig. 10.3 and so is not uniquely associated with a particular hexagraph. In the dual model studies of the triple-regge vertex by Detar and Weiss[27], four contributions are identified (before signature is introduced). These are effectively the first three hexagraphs of Fig. 10.3 and a fourth term identified with triple discontinuities of the form of Fig. 10.5. The above discussion shows that we can identify the fourth term as a sum of terms originating from all three hexagraphs but *with opposite signs* to the usual terms *for the helicity labels involved*. In Part I we adopted a (potentially confusing) convention whereby all helicity labels appearing explicitly would be positive. In fact if we were to continue to particle poles in the  $t_2$  and  $t_3$  channels,  $n_2$  and  $-n_3$  would correspond to  $t_1$ -channel center of mass helicities. Consequently  $n_2$  and  $n_3$  could directly be “ $s$ -channel” helicities for scattering by the exchange of a  $t_1$ -channel state and so, in the language of previous Sections, the partial-waves corresponding to (10.15) involve helicity-flip processes.

The full SW representation of the triple discontinuities of Fig. 10.5 is

$$\begin{aligned}
A_6 &= \int \frac{dn_2 dn_3}{\sin \pi n_2 \sin \pi n_3} \int \frac{d\ell_1 (u_2)^{n_2} (u_3)^{n_3}}{\sin \pi (\ell_1 - n_2 + n_3)} d_{0, n_2 - n_3}^{\ell_1}(z_1) \\
&\times \sum_{\ell_2 - n_2 = 0}^{\infty} d_{n_2, 0}^{\ell_2}(z_2) \sum_{\ell_3 + n_3 = 0}^{\infty} d_{-n_3, 0}^{\ell_3}(z_3) a(\underline{\ell}, \underline{n}) \\
&+ (2 \rightarrow 3, 3 \rightarrow 1, 1 \rightarrow 2) + (2 \rightarrow 1, 3 \rightarrow 2, 1 \rightarrow 3) \\
&+ \text{signed contributions} \\
&+ \text{remaining summations}
\end{aligned} \tag{10.16}$$

In the helicity-pole limit (10.5) Regge poles at  $l_1 = \alpha_1$ ,  $l_2 = \alpha_2$ , and  $l_3 = \alpha_3$ , would give

$$A_6 \sim u_2^{\alpha_2} u_3^{-\alpha_3} z_1^{\alpha_1} \beta_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3} \tag{10.17}$$

$$\sim (z_1 u_2)^{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3)} (z_1 u_3^{-1})^{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_2)/2} (u_2 u_3^{-1})^{(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_1)/2} \beta_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3} \tag{10.18}$$

$$\sim (s_{23})^{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3)/2} (s_{16})^{(\alpha_1 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_2)/2} (s_{35})^{(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \alpha_1)/2} \beta_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3} \tag{10.19}$$

Note that taking the discontinuity in  $s_{23}$  (say) of this expression gives

$$\text{disc}_{s_{23}} \sim \sin[\pi(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3)/2] A_6 \tag{10.20}$$

As in the discussion following I.(4.79) we see that since such a discontinuity factor will not cancel any of the pole factors in  $\beta_{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3}$  emerging from the  $\sin \pi n_2 \sin \pi n_3 \sin \pi(l_1 - n_2 - n_3)$  factor in (10.12), the Steinmann relations imply that these factors cancel in the sum over permutations in (10.16). As a consequence, the triple-regge contribution (10.16) corresponding to triple discontinuities of the form of Fig. 10.5 *has no particle poles in the  $t$ -channels*. It is a pure *multiparticle multi-regge amplitude*.

Finally we note that if a triple-regge amplitude contributes to elastic scattering, as in Fig. 6.8 for example, then since the effective  $s_{35}$  is finite the helicity-pole limit (10.5) is necessarily involved. This is a straightforward way to see that only the triple discontinuity of Fig. 10.4 and the FG amplitudes obtained from (10.12) contribute. *The triple discontinuities of Fig. 10.5 and the FG amplitudes obtained from (10.15) do not contribute.*

## 10.2 The Triangle Singularity in Reggeon Diagrams

For the reasons discussed above we are interested in determining whether all three quark propagators could be simultaneously singular in a reggeon diagram having the structure of Fig. 10.1 and contributing to the Toller diagram of Fig. 10.2. As described at the end of Section 6 (and in Part I) we construct reggeon loop diagrams for Fig. 10.2 by building the triple discontinuities for each hexagraph. If the signature factor of a reggeon propagator within a loop is to be singular, there must not be a discontinuity taken through the reggeon. Consequently, if all quark propagators in Fig. 10.1 are to remain singular the triple discontinuity constructed must be as shown in Fig. 10.6, that is it *must* be of the form of Fig. 10.5(a).

We conclude that if a triangle singularity appears in a triple-regge amplitude then, from the above analysis, it can not appear in the helicity-pole limit (10.4) and therefore *can not appear within a reggeon diagram for elastic scattering*. Such an amplitude can appear in the helicity-pole limit (10.5) or the triple-Regge limit (10.3). The essence of these limits is that the three invariants of (10.13) must all be independently large. This requires that the six-particle scattering process be *three-dimensional, that is not limited to a single transverse plane*.

The three-dimensional requirement for the scattering can be seen by studying directly the simplest possible Feynman diagram that could be involved. That is we consider inserting the three gluon Odderon configuration into Fig. 9.11 to obtain the reggeon diagram shown in Fig. 10.7. As discussed in Section 5, if the three gluons composing  $O$  are emitted in the same transverse plane as the rest of the scattering their coupling would reduce to a single  $\gamma^+$  factor. Given that  $(\gamma^+)^2 = (\gamma^-)^2 = 0$ , and that  $\gamma^+$  and  $\gamma^-$  commute with transverse propagators, it is clearly not possible to obtain a non-zero result by coupling  $O$  into a quark loop as in Fig. 10.7 if the whole process takes place in a single transverse plane. However, if the reggeons comprising  $O$  are exchanged in a plane orthogonal to the scattering plane (in which the quarks lie) then the “ $\gamma^+$ ” coupling will be defined with respect to a different light-cone and we can write

$$\text{“}\gamma^+\text{”} = \gamma^0 + \gamma^z \quad (10.21)$$

where now the “z-axis” lies in the  $k_\perp$ -plane of the rest of the scattering. In this case the transverse-momentum diagram emerging from Fig. 10.7 will be obtained by inserting  $\gamma^z$  and

a further propagator into (9.23). This gives (see Fig. 10.7 for notation)

$$V_A(q, k, k', Q) \sim \int d^2p \frac{\text{Tr} [(-\not{p} + \not{q} + m) \not{k} (-\not{p} - \not{q} + m) \gamma^z (-\not{p} - \not{q} + \not{Q} + m) \not{k}']}{[(p - q)^2 + m^2] [(p + q)^2 + m^2] [(p + q - Q)^2 + m^2]} \quad (10.22)$$

where  $Q$  is orthogonal to  $\gamma^z$ .

To understand some of the essential properties of  $V_A$  we consider first the limit  $q^2 \rightarrow 0$  with  $m$  non-zero.

$$V_A \underset{q \rightarrow 0}{\sim} \int d^2p \frac{\text{Tr} [(-\not{p} + m) \not{k} (-\not{p} + m) \gamma^z (-\not{p} + \not{Q} + m) \not{k}']}{[p^2 + m^2] [(p - Q)^2 + m^2]} \quad (10.23)$$

Picking out the “ $m^2$ ” term in the numerator we obtain

$$V_A \underset{m \rightarrow 0}{\sim} m^2 \int \frac{d^2p \text{Tr} [\not{k} \gamma^z \not{Q} \not{k}']}{[p^2 + m^2]^2 Q^2} + \dots \quad (10.24)$$

$$\sim \frac{\epsilon_{ij} k_i k'_j}{Q} \quad (10.25)$$

which illustrates that (when  $q^2 \rightarrow 0$ ) there is a singular component of the vertex (of just the form we are looking for) which involves helicity transitions. Clearly this vertex has a structure very close to that of the familiar triangle anomaly. The reduction to a transverse momentum diagram produced by the Regge limit has enhanced the triangle singularity. As a result a helicity transition on the quark line to which the Odderon is coupled survives the massless limit and produces the same result as if we had coupled an axial-vector current to the quark-loop rather than the anomalous Odderon. (In the next Section we shall identify the corresponding axial-vector current as the “winding-number operator”.)

An essential feature of  $V_A$  that we shall need in the following is that if we consider the “scaling limit”  $q, k, k' \sim 0$ , involving all the gluons besides those in the Odderon configuration, followed by  $Q \rightarrow 0$ , then as illustrated by (10.25) we can write

$$V_A \sim \frac{R(k, k', q)}{Q} \quad (10.26)$$

where  $R(q, k, k')$  is non-singular and has the straightforward scaling dimensions of the four-reggeized gluon vertex  $R_{2,2}^0$ . By similarly coupling the Odderon configuration in to a multigluon

quark loop interaction of the form illustrated in Fig. 9.17 and considering the corresponding scaling limit, we will obtain a general result of the form of (10.26) with the numerator a scaling multi-gluon vertex. Therefore, such vertices allow the O configuration to be emitted *out of the transverse plane* by a general zero-transverse momentum set of gluons, with a  $Q^{-1}$  coupling and *without affecting the scaling interaction of the gluon set*. As we have already discussed (following (10.20)), because of the structure of the triple-regge vertex involved, there are necessarily no singular signature factors (particle poles) associated with the propagation of the O configuration. However, if the configuration couples between sets of propagating gluons (in distinct transverse planes), as illustrated in Fig. 10.8, then the combination of  $Q^{-1}$  factors for each coupling will produce the same divergence as if there were a signature factor present. As we shall discuss again in the next Section, we believe that the role of the triangle anomaly interaction among pure gluon configurations is therefore to provide a coupling between overall infra-red divergences associated with the Odderon configuration in each distinct transverse plane of a multi-regge diagram.

It will be important for the discussion of Section 12 to consider the possibility that some of the gluons involved in a multi-gluon coupling via the anomaly may actually be massive and carrying finite transverse momentum. (For our present discussion it will be sufficient to consider such gluons as singlets under the SU(2) gauge symmetry). To obtain the full triangle singularity, there must be zero transverse momentum flowing around the quark loop involved. However, a massive gluon pair can clearly be produced at one vertex as illustrated in Fig. 10.9, for example. If we select the part of this vertex which does not vanish when the transverse momentum of the massive pair vanishes then (essentially because of the structure of (10.24)) it *will vanish* as the transverse momentum of the massless gluons coupled at the same vertex vanishes. Consequently while the  $Q^{-1}$  divergence produced by the O configuration coupling can compensate for this vanishing and combine with the coupling of the other massless gluons to produce overall scaling behavior, it can not generate a new divergence. Interactions of this form, where multiple massive gluon states are produced at zero transverse momentum by a massless configuration involving the Odderon, are a crucial part of the relationship between the Super-Critical Pomeron and QCD with the gauge symmetry partly broken.

To complete our description of the role played by triangle anomaly interactions we now discuss the emission of the Odderon configuration from quark/antiquark reggeon states.



This relates to the anomaly structure of flavor currents and so we expect it to be crucial in determining whether chiral symmetry breaking is an outcome of our analysis. It is well-known that the triangle anomaly in flavor axial-vector current vertices determines[48] that chiral symmetry breaking must accompany confinement in QCD (with a sufficiently large number of flavors).

We have noted that  $I = 0$  quark/antiquark reggeon states are infra-red finite and that if they carry flavor they produce leading reggeon singularities. We have also noted that the dynamics of reggeon interactions in such channels will be dominated by the four-quark vertex  $R_0^Q$ . An Odderon configuration can also be emitted *out of the transverse plane* by a triangle reggeon interaction involving  $R_0^Q$ , as illustrated in Fig. 10.11. The interaction now has the form

$$V_A^Q(k, k', q, Q) \sim \int d^2p \frac{Tr \left[ (-\not{p} + \not{q} + m) K_0^Q (-\not{p} + \not{q} + m) \gamma^z (-\not{p} - \not{q} + Q + m) K_0^Q \right]}{[(p - q)^2 + m^2] [(p + q)^2 + m^2] [(p + q - Q)^2 + m^2]} \quad (10.27)$$

As we discussed in Section 8 we can separate the quark/antiquark reggeon state into “vector” and “axial-vector” components which are respectively odd and even under parity. We shall assume now that the corresponding anomalous vertex functions  $V_{VV}^Q$  and  $V_{AA}^Q$  satisfy similar Ward Identity properties to current vertex functions. That is

$$V_{AVV}^Q(k, k', q, Q) \xrightarrow{q \rightarrow 0} 0 \quad (10.28)$$

whereas

$$V_{AAA}^Q(k, k', q, Q) \not\xrightarrow{q \rightarrow 0} 0 \quad (10.29)$$

These properties can only hold away from the triangle singularity, that is for  $Q \neq 0$ . Since both  $V_{VV}^Q$  and  $V_{AA}^Q$  contain the infra-red anomaly they will also satisfy (10.26) if we first set  $q^2 = 0$ . In the next Sections we effectively use the presence of the triangle singularity at  $Q = 0$ ,  $q = 0$  to determine when a coupling to the anomalous Odderon exists. We then assume, and exploit crucially in the next Section, that in addition there is also a *finite, non-divergent, coupling* to the quark/antiquark states given by  $V_{VV}^Q$  and  $V_{AA}^Q$  at  $Q = 0, q \neq 0$ , and that (10.28) and (10.29) are satisfied by these finite couplings.

Clearly we should study whether (10.28) and (10.29) hold in more detail. In particular we should consider whether a more elaborate treatment of the transverse momentum cut-off we impose is necessary to achieve (10.28). We would not expect this to be the case since the integral defining  $V_A^Q$  is strongly convergent in the ultra-violet region, in contrast to the convergence of the integrals defining  $V_c$  in Section 9, where we have argued that Ward Identity properties are necessarily violated in the presence of the transverse cut-off.

We now move on to discuss how the various infra-red properties we have discussed in the last three Sections can be put together to extract a “hadron” high-energy S-Matrix from the reggeon diagrams of SU(2) gauge theory.

## 11. THE SU(2) HIGH-ENERGY S-MATRIX AND THE SCHWINGER MODEL

In this Section we describe how the structure of the anomalous interactions discussed in the last Section can build up the confining spectrum and high-energy S-Matrix for SU(2) gauge theory with many fermions. We shall then go on to briefly review properties of the two-dimensional Schwinger model and draw on this to understand the physics behind our results. Indeed we are more confident of the physical description of our results than we are of many of the details of the (necessarily) elaborate technical derivation that we outline. Of necessity we must discuss reggeon diagrams for a large class of Toller diagrams for which we do not strictly have the appropriate rules in hand. Indeed the anomalous helicity structure of triple-regge vertices exploited in the previous Section has until now been outside of the framework of reggeon diagram and Reggeon Field Theory studies. This provides a major reason for the largely qualitative nature of the description that follows. Another is simply the large amount of work that is still needed to fully implement the analysis.

We first summarize the separate ingredients which we have established in previous Sections and then describe their combination into a (potentially) comprehensive analysis.

### 11.1 Zero Transverse Momentum Gluons Surviving Exponentiation

We have shown that all configurations of gluon reggeons carrying non-zero color are removed by the process of inversion of infra-red divergences. Configurations with color zero and with some subset carrying zero transverse momentum are similarly eliminated. Gluon configurations which *all* carry zero transverse momentum can occur accompanying color zero quark reggeon states that carry the transverse momentum of the state. To avoid removal by inversion of infra-red divergences (via further reggeon interactions) such configurations must carry anomalous Odderon quantum numbers. Therefore these are the only zero transverse momentum gluon configurations which survive in the theory. We have not explicitly stated it but clearly the concept of an “anomalous Odderon” gluon configuration generalises to *any odd number* of reggeized gluons carrying  $I = 0$  and  $C = +1$ . As we discuss below, full gauge invariance implies that we should expect the sum total of such configurations to be related to the exponentiation of the winding-number operator.

## 11.2 Anomalous Odderon Couplings

The most crucial Odderon coupling is the pure glue coupling  $V_A$  since this provides a “three-Odderon coupling” at zero transverse momentum as illustrated in Fig. 11.1. This coupling will produce an additional divergence for every Odderon configuration that propagates out of one transverse plane and in to another. Consequently, as we elaborate below, the most infra-red divergent multi-Regge amplitudes are those which have (essentially) an Odderon divergence in each reggeon channel (that is for each line of the associated Toller diagram) and this is what ultimately defines physical reggeon amplitudes.

In addition to the divergent Odderon configuration, there must also be a quark/antiquark component to each reggeon state which carries the total transverse momentum of the state. The quark/antiquark component can emit (or absorb) an Odderon configuration via an anomalous interaction but since it carries finite transverse momentum *there will be no additional infra-red divergence* produced by such an emission (or absorption). We therefore envisage a reggeon state in a general Toller diagram as emitting an arbitrary (odd) number of Odderon configurations out of the transverse plane which are absorbed elsewhere in the reggeon diagram as illustrated in Fig. 11.2. In general any two lines of the Toller diagram separated by at least one further internal line can be connected. However, as we discuss below, there are very important constraints placed on such connections by the discontinuity structure of the hexagraph involved.

Note that a major implication of the necessity to have a quark/antiquark component in all reggeon states is that there is *no Pomeron*. That is *there are no pure gluon reggeon states*. Therefore all cross-sections will decrease like  $O(1/S)$  and we will have a non-interacting theory at high-energy. In the language of Part I *the S-Matrix will be “trivial” in an extreme sense*.

## 11.3 The Flavor Anomaly and Chiral Symmetry Breaking

It is well-known that the presence of a triangle anomaly in vertex functions of the flavor axial-vector currents determines that in general chiral symmetry breaking must accompany confinement in a gauge theory[48]. As we implied in the last Section we expect the Odderon coupling to quark/antiquark reggeon states to reflect this anomaly structure and to determine the pattern of chiral symmetry breaking as follows.

As we discussed in Section 9, the leading reggeon singularity at low transverse mo-

momentum  $q$ , in quark/antiquark channels, is the two-reggeon cut (9.5) - before the gluon mass is taken to zero. In the massless (gluon) limit the quark reggeization disappears via the cancellation of infra-red divergences. Complimentarity should imply that this behaviour is smoothly replaced by a “bound state” reggeon singularity formed (predominantly) by the iteration of the  $R_0^Q$  interaction. This singularity will be a Regge pole if we can introduce asymptotic freedom and the running of the gauge coupling as the transverse cut-off is removed. From (9.5) it follows that this singularity will have a  $q^2 = 0$  intercept of  $j = 0$  as the gluon mass is removed *if the quark mass is zero*. It can be moved from zero if the cut-off is varied *after* the zero gluon mass limit is taken. Therefore (if we allow the cut-off to vary) we can say only that there will be an *odd signature* reggeon bound state with “mass close to zero”. As we have noted this odd signature state will combine with the Odderon state to give an overall *even signature* state capable of producing a physical, spin zero, particle.

At non-zero  $q^2$  the bound state can emit and absorb O configurations as described above, and illustrated in Fig. 11.2. This produces a renormalization of the bound state Regge trajectory which, because of (10.28) and (10.29), distinguishes between the distinct parity states. The *abnormal* parity (“axial”) state will be *driven away from zero mass* by this renormalization whereas, because of (10.28), the *normal* parity (“vector”) state will remain close to zero. The combined reggeon state - Odderon plus bound state - producing a physical spin zero state will then have *abnormal parity* and the *physical particle will be a pseudoscalar*.

#### 11.4 The Multi-Regge S-Matrix

We now describe how, in principle at least, we anticipate physical amplitudes emerging from our analysis. As an extension of the complimentarity principle discussed in Section 7, we assume that the multi-reggeon S-Matrix (associated with the complete set of Toller diagrams and) describing those Regge poles and cuts that can be exchanged by physical scattering states should evolve smoothly as the infra-red limit is taken. For this to be the case it must be that any infra-red divergences that occur can be absorbed into a redefinition (as a normalization factor) of the *particle* states that are scattering - leaving a finite multi-Regge amplitude. If we assume that all physical states are correspondingly renormalized, then it will follow that finite physical scattering amplitudes are produced only when the (originally) infra-red divergent reggeon amplitudes are involved.

We shall shortly discuss the construction of physical states in the massless Schwinger model. This will lead us to suggest that the Odderon divergences we find are related to the development of an expectation value for the exponential of the winding number operator. In effect the need to include a “cloud of topological gluon configurations” in our definition of physical states replaces the need to include a “simpler cloud of soft photons” in our definition of physical states in  $QED$ , and is responsible for confinement. For the reasons discussed in Section 7, we are assuming that complementarity allows the detection of this phenomenon in the infra-red divergences of reggeon diagrams. We clearly can not follow the process of redefinition of the particle states in detail, but we can discuss the reggeon states. As we have just described, these will include the bound-state Regge poles that will produce hadrons and by continuing to the associated particle poles we can, in principle, extract high-energy hadron scattering amplitudes.

Consider the general divergence structure to be expected in an arbitrary Toller amplitude. At first sight it might appear that the propagating O configurations illustrated in Fig. 11.2 can be arbitrarily attached across a general multi-regge amplitude. It would then appear that *divergent* O configurations could connect, via the triple Odderon coupling of Fig. 11.1, to any pair propagating between distinct transverse planes. However, as we have emphasised, our general procedure requires that we construct the individual hexagraph amplitudes involved via their multiple discontinuities. This is particularly important, as we found when discussing the Super-Critical Pomeron in Part I, if we want to ensure that the Regge pole states we generate produce physical particle poles (and corresponding particle amplitudes as residues) in the amplitudes we study. In a general diagram of the form of Fig. 11.2, the discontinuity structure of individual hexagraphs strongly constrains both the non-divergent O configurations that can be present and the triple Odderon couplings that can be added.

As an example, if we want a four-particle amplitude to be associated with the sub-Toller diagram of Fig. 11.3, then the discontinuity shown (or the corresponding cross-channel discontinuity) must be present. This discontinuity is present only if O configurations crossing from the bottom to the top of the diagram (and vice versa) are absent. When this requirement is combined with the constraint that only odd number O configurations must be associated with any particular reggeon channel, we essentially obtain the maximum degree of divergence in diagrams of the form of Fig. 11.4 (together with the corresponding crossed diagrams) in which a single divergent O configuration can be explicitly identified with the reggeon state in

the discontinuity channel. When this argument is extended to the more complicated multiple discontinuities of general diagrams, a divergence can always be identified with each of the internal reggeon lines. For example, divergences of the sub-triple regge diagram with the discontinuities of Fig. 11.5 can be identified as in Fig. 11.6. We conclude, therefore, that there is a divergent zero transverse momentum component, that is a “reggeon condensate”, as part of the definition of each reggeon state.

### 11.5 The Winding Number Operator

To begin our discussion of the physical significance of the Odderon divergence we remark that the Odderon has the same color structure as the first term in the well-known gauge dependent current

$$K^\mu(x) = \frac{g^2}{8\pi^2} \epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\gamma} \text{Tr} \left[ -\frac{2ig}{3} \epsilon_{ijk} A_\alpha^i A_\beta^j A_\gamma^k + A_\alpha^i \partial_\beta A_\gamma^i \right] \quad (11.1)$$

whose divergence is given by

$$\partial_\mu K^\mu = F \tilde{F} \quad (11.2)$$

If  $K_\mu$  is integrated over a three-dimensional volume, we obtain a zero-momentum component which defines the familiar “winding-number” for which instantons produce integer-valued transitions and (the exponential of) which is *gauge invariant*. Note that if a gauge field is pure gauge then *only* the first term in (11.1) contributes to the winding number.

The Odderon is not produced by a local operator but rather is an infra-red configuration that couples into the infra-red region of quark loops in essentially the same way as the winding number operator. Clearly the existence of an Odderon reggeon condensate is very similar to the existence of a winding number condensate and can be usefully thought of as a “generalized winding number condensate. Nevertheless we should emphasize that, as we have introduced it, a reggeon condensate is something specifically involved in the definition of a scattering hadron in the Regge region and as such is *not a property of the vacuum*. However, since we essentially have a non-interacting theory at high-energy there may be *no distinction between a property of hadrons and a property of “the infinite momentum vacuum”*.

### 11.6 The Schwinger Model

The Schwinger model, or massless  $QED_2$ , is explicitly solvable and provides considerable physical insight into the meaning of an expectation value for a winding number

operator. For this reason it will be helpful to our overall purpose to provide a very brief synopsis of the solution of the model based on Manton's treatment[2]. Manton's comments on the relationship between the Schwinger Model and  $QCD$  will also help us elucidate the potential physical significance of our analysis.

The lagrangian is

$$L = \frac{1}{2e^2} (\partial_t A_x - \partial_x A_t)^2 + \bar{\psi} i \gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu + i A_\mu) \psi \quad (11.3)$$

It is helpful to initially "compactify space" by regarding the theory as defined on a circle  $0 \leq x \leq 2\pi$  and ultimately take the infinite radius limit. In the Coulomb gauge we can take

$$\partial_x A_x = 0, \quad 0 \leq A_x \leq 1 \quad (11.4)$$

with  $A_x = 0, 1$  being gauge equivalent. A winding number  $n$  can be defined for gauge transformations

$$g(x) = \exp [i\Lambda(x)], \quad \Lambda(2\pi) = \Lambda(0) + 2\pi n \quad (11.5)$$

A topologically non-trivial gauge transformation takes  $A_x$  from the interval (11.4) to an alternative interval.

We define the electric current  $j^\mu = \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \psi$  and the chiral current  $j_5^\mu = \bar{\psi} \gamma^\mu \gamma^5 \psi$ . There is an *anomaly equation*

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_\mu j_s^\mu &= \frac{1}{\pi} \partial_\mu W^\mu = \frac{1}{\pi} \partial_\mu \epsilon^{\mu\nu} A_\nu \\ &= -\partial_t A_x \text{ in Coulomb gauge} \end{aligned} \quad (11.6)$$

and so  $W^\mu$  is the analogue of the winding number current in a four-dimensional gauge theory. In Coulomb gauge we can take  $A_x$  itself to be the winding number. Clearly it changes by an integer under a gauge transformation with non-trivial topology.

The Dirac operator appearing in (11.3) is

$$\begin{pmatrix} -i\partial_x + A_x & 0 \\ 0 & i\partial_x - A_x \end{pmatrix} \quad (11.7)$$

and gives an energy spectrum

$$\begin{aligned} p + A_x &\quad \text{for "left - handed" fermions} \\ -p - A_x &\quad \text{for "right - handed" fermions} \end{aligned} \quad (11.8)$$



with  $p$  taking all integer values. The anomaly equation (11.6) is satisfied non-trivially because the Dirac operator has a “spectral flow” of two in that as we “orbit” the configuration space  $0 \leq A_x \leq 1$  the spectrum is permuted. The energy of left-handed fermions increases by one while that of right-handed fermions decreases by one.

Introducing creation operators via

$$\psi_j(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sum_{k=-\infty}^{\infty} a_{j,k} e^{ikx} \quad j = 1, 2 \quad (11.9)$$

the left and right-handed charge operators must be regularized. A gauge-invariant procedure for states with a finite number of positive energy left-handed particles is to define

$$Q_L^\lambda = \sum_{-\infty} e^{\lambda(k+A_x)} a_{1k}^\dagger a_{1k} \quad (11.10)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\lambda \rightarrow 0} \sum_{k=-\infty}^M e^{\lambda(k+A_x)} = \frac{1}{\lambda} + \left(M + A_x + \frac{1}{2}\right) + 0(\lambda) \quad (11.11)$$

if all energy levels  $\leq M$  are occupied, with a similar definition for a state with all right-handed momenta  $\leq N$  occupied. Removing the  $\frac{1}{\lambda}$  divergences gives regularized charges for such states

$$Q_L^{\text{reg}} = M + A_x + \frac{1}{2}, \quad Q_R^{\text{reg}} = -N - A_x + \frac{1}{2} \quad (11.12)$$

which are non-integer (“fractional charge”) and depend on  $A_x$ . The dependence on  $A_x$  is a necessary consequence of the spectral flow, and leads to the crucial conclusion that *states with non-zero electric charge are unphysical* precisely because the dependence on  $A_x$  does not cancel in physical quantities. In particular, charged states do not have gauge-invariant momenta.

The zero momentum states of the theory can be found very easily and involve no fermionic excitations. They are specified by a set of wave-functions

$$\{\psi_p(A_x) : P \in \mathbb{Z}, 0 \leq A_x \leq 1\} \quad (11.13)$$

where  $\psi_p$  denotes the amplitude for a state in which left-handed particles with all momenta  $\geq p$  are present and right-handed particles with all momenta  $\leq p+1$  are present. Clearly such states have zero charge. The existence of spectral flow imposes the boundary conditions

$$\psi_p(1) = \psi_{p+1}(0), \quad \partial_{A_x} \psi_p(1) = \partial_{A_x} \psi_{p+1}(0) \quad (11.14)$$

If the kinetic energy in (11.3) is regularized as we have regularized the charges, we obtain the regularized energy

$$V_p^{\text{reg}}(A_x) = \left(p + A_x + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \quad (11.15)$$

We now effectively mix the topological sectors of the gauge field by defining an energy  $V(A_x)$  and a wave-function  $\psi(A_x)$  on the whole interval  $-\infty < A_x < \infty$  by writing

$$V(p + A_x) = V_p(A_x), \quad \psi(p + A_x) = \psi(A_x) \quad (11.16)$$

If we then use Gauss's Law to eliminate  $A_t$  in (11.3) and make the approximation of ignoring the resultant Coulomb energy we obtain the Schroedinger equation

$$i \frac{\partial \psi}{\partial t} = \left[ -\frac{e^2}{4\pi^2} \frac{d^2}{dA_x^2} + \left(A_x + \frac{1}{2}\right)^2 \right] \psi \quad (11.17)$$

This is a harmonic oscillator equation with the energy eigenvalues spaced by  $e/\sqrt{\pi}$ , giving the energy spectrum of the free scalar multiparticle zero momentum states which are known to solve the Schwinger model. The ground-state has

$$A_x = -\frac{1}{2} \quad (11.18)$$

which includes

$$p = -1, \quad A_x = \frac{1}{2} \quad (11.19)$$

in which, from (11.12), there are “no fermions”, but also includes additional topological sectors with compensating pairs of fermions - because of spectral flow. The gauge-invariant statement of (11.18) is that the “Wilson Loop” operator

$$\begin{aligned} \exp \left[ i \int_0^{2\pi} dx W^t \right] &= \exp \left[ 2\pi i A_x \right] \text{ in Coulomb gauge} \\ &= -1 \end{aligned} \quad (11.20)$$

since this holds in all topological sectors.

Summarizing - *the existence of spectral flow and the chiral anomaly leads to the appearance of the winding number field in the regularized chiral charges. The topological classification of gauge fields breaks down and a vacuum winding-number field emerges which stabilizes a “confinement spectrum” of non-interacting particles.*

### 11.7 Massive $QED_2$

It is possible to define massive  $QED_2$  in which a fermion mass term is added to (11.3). The theory is rigorously defined by mass perturbation theory around the massless theory[49]. After bosonization of the theory the fermion mass becomes the coupling constant for the non-interacting massive bosons of the massless fermion theory. That is the massless Schwinger model provides the free theory around which the interacting theory is defined perturbatively. The spectrum of the massive theory is continuously related to that of the massless theory and therefore is also confining. However, in the massive theory there is *no vacuum field* and instead the theory has *interactions* - with the interaction between charged particles increasing with distance as in strong-coupling lattice  $QCD$ . This is the well-known parallel[50] between strong-coupling confinement in  $QCD$  and confinement in massive  $QED_2$ .

The “chiral limit” of massive  $QED_2$  exists, in a sense, because of the interplay between massless fermions and gauge field topology. It is presumably also true that topology is able to govern the spectrum of the massless theory just because of the lack of interactions among the physical states.

### 11.8 Comparison with Non-Abelian Theories in Four Dimensions

In a four-dimensional theory the operator which plays a similar role to the phase-factor (11.20) is the gauge invariant exponential of the winding number operator referred to above, that is

$$X = \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{8\pi} \int d^3 \underline{x} K^0(x) \right] \quad (11.21)$$

where  $K^0(x)$  is defined by (11.1). In addition to being referred to as the winding number operator,  $K^0(x)$  is also known as the “Chern-Simons 3-form”. Similarly  $A_x$  is known as the abelian “Chern-Simons 1-form”. Topologically trivial gauge transformations do not change  $X$  at all. A gauge transformation with non-trivial topology produces a phase change of  $2\pi n$ , where  $n$  is an integer, and therefore also leaves  $X$  unchanged. In general a closed loop in Yang-Mills configuration space (produced by some parameter variation) is defined to be “noncontractable” if (and only if) the phase of  $X$  changes continuously by  $2\pi n$  along it.

An instanton is a gauge field which traverses a noncontractable loop with Euclidean time as the parameter. Also it is known that the Dirac operator has a nonvanishing spectral flow along noncontractible loops. In analogy with the Schwinger model, therefore, the pres-

ence of massless fermions changes the topology of the Yang-Mills gauge field configuration space and it is again necessary to pass to the simply connected covering space. Therefore we might anticipate that the U(1) axial anomaly equation for the color singlet axial-vector current  $j_5^\mu$

$$\partial_\mu j_5^\mu = -N_f F \tilde{F} / 16\pi^2 \quad (11.22)$$

combined with the effects of instantons will similarly lead to a non-trivial winding number vacuum field which minimizes the sum of the classical potential energy and the regularized energy of the Dirac sea.

As we discussed at length in Section 3, we expect that when there are only a small number of massless fermions in the theory, the effects of large gauge field fluctuations associated with renormalons (including the infra-red growth of the gauge coupling) will overwhelm instanton contributions - if these are even well-defined! However, as the theory is saturated with massless fermions we have argued that instantons and the regularization of the Dirac sea that we are now discussing become the dominant dynamical problem. Clearly we want to argue that the reggeon condensate we have discovered is due to just this phenomenon.

First we note that we begin our analysis with both infra-red and ultra-violet cut-offs in the theory. In this case perturbation theory is Borel summable and there are no non-perturbative contributions associated with either instantons or renormalons. In principle at least, there is no reason why the appropriate “non-perturbative” contributions can not be generated by the limiting processes involved in removing the infra-red and ultra-violet cut-offs. As a simple illustrative example, note that

$$\exp \left[ 1/(g^2 + \mu/\lambda) \right] \quad (11.23)$$

has a perturbation expansion for finite  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$ . If the “infra-red” cut-off  $\mu$  is removed, with  $\lambda$  finite, a “non-perturbative” result is smoothly obtained. This provides a very over-simplified version of how we believe the “non-perturbative” elements of a theory can be produced by the process of removing cut-offs. Indeed the removal of cut-offs while maintaining unitarity and exploiting “complimentarity” as we have done *could conceivably be the only way to rigorously define non-perturbative contributions to a theory.*

Secondly we note that while we have described the “topological” formulation of the Schwinger model in order to draw the parallel with the physics of gauge theories that we believe our analysis is exposing, the Schwinger model can also be “solved” [51] (or defined) by the

process of summing perturbation theory and removing cut-offs - *provided that the anomaly is appropriately regularized from the outset*. Analogously, we believe that the interaction of the Odderon configuration with the massless quark singularities of reggeon diagrams, as we remove the gluon mass, does indeed anticipate the development of instanton contributions and the problem of the Dirac sea. In effect we are imposing unitarity on the solution of this problem. However, that there should be a direct correspondence between all the infra-red “perturbative” phenomena that we have been discussing and the “non-perturbative” instanton interactions of the theory is a very strong requirement. It could be that, in the case of *QCD*, the complicated set of fermion interactions produced by the condensate and instanton interactions of a color-sextet quark sector are (as we suggest in Section 14) essential to realise this requirement.

We also anticipate that, again as in the Schwinger model, the development of a “topological” condensate can be the whole story only if the theory is essentially non-interacting. As we have described, our high-energy *confining* solution of  $SU(2)$  gauge theory is noninteracting because there is no Pomeron. In effect the anomaly acts as a transverse-momentum infra-red boundary effect, coupling non-interacting (quark/antiquark) reggeon states in distinct reggeon channels. A conventional description of confinement can become appropriate as we go to lower energy (if quarks are massive) just as a conventional description of confinement becomes appropriate when the fermions of the Schwinger model are given a mass. Note that once the infra-red limit for gluons has been taken there is no reason why we should not add quark masses via some form of chiral perturbation theory. Clearly the high-energy non-interacting S-Matrix will not be affected.

We have still not discussed the removal of the transverse cut-off in reggeon diagrams. Of course, if we consider only the non-interacting high-energy S-Matrix it is trivial that it is cut-off independent. Also, there is no obvious conflict in assuming that asymptotic freedom can be utilized to remove the cut-off in diagrams, such as those of Figs. 11.4 and 11.6, which describe the scattering of mesons via meson exchange. However, since the meson mass is a cut-off dependent parameter, we might expect problems. As we discuss in the next two Sections, when the full gauge symmetry group is bigger than  $SU(2)$ , it seems that (at least in principle) there are physical parameters which remain after the cut-off is removed and which determine the chiral and high-energy limits.

## 12. SPONTANEOUSLY-BROKEN QCD AND THE SUPER-CRITICAL POMERON.

Having analysed  $SU(2)$  gauge theory exhaustively we finally move on to the physical problem of  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry. We recall from Section 7 that we are instructed to first break the symmetry with two color triplet (Higgs) scalar fields, each of which acquires an expectation value. This breaks the local gauge symmetry completely but leaves the same global  $SU(2)$  symmetry that we have exploited throughout our discussion of  $SU(2)$  gauge theory. Decoupling one scalar field then converts the global  $SU(2)$  symmetry to a local gauge symmetry. The corresponding infra-red analysis of reggeon diagrams is very closely related to our previous discussion and will be the subject of this Section. As we have discussed several times already, we anticipate that in this case the reggeon (winding number) condensate described in the last Section will be directly related to the Pomeron condensate of the Super-Critical Pomeron phase.

### 12.1 Gluon Representation Structure

The two Higgs field expectation values provide two mass scales which we can associate with the global  $SU(2)$  properties of the octet of  $SU(3)$  gluons as follows. As illustrated in Fig. 12.1, there is

- i) an  $SU(2)$  triplet  $[G_3]$  with mass  $M_1$ ,
- ii) 2  $SU(2)$  doublets  $[G_2^1, G_2^2]$  with mass  $\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}M_2 + O(M_1)$ ,
- iii) an  $SU(2)$  singlet  $[G_0]$  with mass  $M_2 + O(M_1)$ .

(12.1)

In the limit  $M_1 \rightarrow 0$  the triplet of gluons  $G_3$  becomes massless and  $SU(2)$  gauge symmetry is restored. If there is confinement at this stage then we would expect not only the triplet  $G_3$  but also the doublets  $G_2^1, G_2^2$  to disappear from the physical spectrum. We shall discuss just how we incorporate this in our analysis shortly. The most important aspect of the above gluon spectrum is, however, the existence of the  $SU(2)$  singlet  $G_0$ . This will provide the reggeized vector gluon trajectory which must exist in the Super-Critical Pomeron phase and which should be exchange degenerate with the Pomeron trajectory.

The  $SU(3)$  gauge couplings between the different  $SU(2)$  gluon representations  $G_i$  are as illustrated in Fig. 12.2. They are simply given by the “antisymmetric”  $SU(3)$  structure constants  $c_{ijk}$  and in an obvious notation (sufficient for our purposes) the couplings which exist are

$$r_{333}, \quad r_{322}, \quad r_{022}. \quad (12.2)$$

Note that there is no self-coupling for the  $G_0$  singlet. For  $SU(3)$  and bigger gauge groups there is a “symmetric”  $d_{ijk}$  tensor which will play a role in our discussion shortly. It will be convenient to list the corresponding couplings in the same notation as (12.2). They are, as illustrated in Fig. 12.3,

$$r_{322}, \quad r_{033}, \quad r_{000} \quad (12.3)$$

and clearly a self-coupling for  $G_0$  is included. The existence of the triple Pomeron coupling will be tied to the existence of  $r_{000}$ .

Consider now the properties of the  $G_i$  and the  $r_{ijk}$  under the *color parity* operation introduced in Section 9. If this is defined as “G - parity” with respect to the  $SU(2)$  global symmetry then both (12.2) and (12.3) are possible couplings for vector states. However, if it is defined from the gauge field transposition (9.47) extended to  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry then the couplings (12.3) violate this symmetry. (9.47) is, of course, a symmetry of the pure  $SU(3)$  lagrangian and it is well-known that the  $d_{ijk}$  couplings can not appear in the gauge-field self-interaction. Nevertheless a triple-Pomeron coupling has to have the symmetry property of the  $d_{ijk}$  and so it will be important to understand how this coupling can arise for an “unphysical” reggeon such as the Pomeron. It will also be important for understanding whether the Pomeron can produce physical particles.

## 12.2 Trajectory Functions

When  $M_1, M_2 \neq 0$  all gluons reggeize and we can represent the reggeization in terms of reggeon diagrams and the couplings of Fig. 12.2 - as shown in Fig. 12.4. In the infra-red limit  $M_1 \rightarrow 0$ , the  $G_0$  trajectory is infra-red finite simply because the triplet  $G_3$  does not couple to  $G_0$  in lowest order. The existence of the massive doublets  $G_2$  allows  $G_0$  to remain reggeized. The doublet trajectory contains an infra-red divergence from the first of the two reggeon diagrams in Fig. 12.4. In the notation of Section 5 this gives the transverse

momentum integral

$$J_1(M_1^2, M_2^2, \underline{q}^2) = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^3} \int \frac{d^2 \underline{k}}{\left[ (\underline{q} - \underline{k})^2 - M_1^2 \right] \left[ \underline{k}^2 - M_2^2 \right]} \quad (12.4)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{Q}} \ell n \left[ \frac{(\underline{q}^2 + \Delta + \sqrt{Q})(\underline{q}^2 - \Delta + \sqrt{Q})}{(\underline{q}^2 + \Delta - \sqrt{Q})(\underline{q}^2 - \Delta - \sqrt{Q})} \right] \quad (12.5)$$

with

$$Q = \left[ \underline{q}^2 - (M_1 - M_2)^2 \right] \left[ \underline{q}^2 - (M_1 + M_2)^2 \right] \quad (12.6)$$

$$\Delta = M_2^2 - M_1^2.$$

We can separate the divergences of  $J_1$  as  $M_1$  and  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$  by writing

$$J_1(M_1^2, M_2^2, \underline{q}^2) = J_1^1(M_1^2, M_2^2, \underline{q}^2) + J_1^2(M_1^2, M_2^2, \underline{q}^2) \quad (12.7)$$

where

$$J_1^1 = \frac{2}{\sqrt{Q}} \ell n \left[ \frac{\underline{q}^2 + \Delta + \sqrt{Q}}{\underline{q}^2 + \Delta - \sqrt{Q}} \right] \quad (12.8)$$

$$M_1^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} 0 - \frac{1}{2(\underline{q}^2 - M_2^2)} \ell n \left[ \frac{\underline{q}^2}{M_2^2} \right]$$

If we absorb  $J_1^2$  into the reggeon interaction for the doublet there will be an infra-red cancellation in the color-zero channel and furthermore the trajectory will then satisfy

$$\alpha_2(\underline{q}^2) \xrightarrow{M_1^2 \rightarrow 0} 1 - \frac{3g^2}{4\pi^2} \ell n \left[ \frac{\underline{q}^2}{M_2^2} \right] + \dots \quad (12.9)$$

$$\underline{q}^2 \xrightarrow{\sim} 0 - \infty \quad (12.10)$$

The high-energy behavior associated with the doublet is then negligible for  $q \rightarrow 0$  and we shall ignore it in the following. The only contribution of the doublets is therefore that they provide physical massive states responsible for the reggeization of the singlet gluon  $G_0$ . Hopefully, this is an adequate description of their confined status in the limit  $M_1 \rightarrow 0$ .



### 12.3 Reggeon Diagrams and the Pomeron

We suppose now that the  $SU(2)$  infra-red analysis has been carried out exactly as discussed in previous Sections. Clearly the Odderon plus quark/antiquark reggeon states can form in just the same way. The difference will be that we will now have additional “unconfined” gluon and quark states that are  $SU(2)$  singlets. Since we ignore the high-energy behavior of the  $G_2$  states, the only gluon reggeon states we need to consider are those involving the singlet  $G_0$ . We have illustrated the reggeization of  $G_0$  in Fig. 12.4. The reggeization of the singlet quarks will involve both  $G_0$  and the  $G_2^i$ .

The first point we note is that the  $SU(2)$  anomalous Odderon divergence can now accompany  $G_0$  states (and singlet quark states) in just the same manner as for the quark/antiquark states discussed in the previous Section. The first approximation to meson elastic scattering will be as illustrated in Fig. 12.5. That is we *now have a Pomeron*. The “Pomeron” is simply the exchange of a  $G_0$  reggeon in the “background” of the Odderon condensate. Note that  $G_0$  will, in first approximation, simply couple to either the quark or antiquark in the meson. Because the Odderon gluons contribute only at zero transverse momentum (via the divergence), it follows that the Pomeron Regge trajectory will simply be given by

$$\alpha_{\mathbb{P}}(t) = \alpha_{G_0}(t) \quad (12.11)$$

that is the “Pomeron” trajectory is exchange degenerate with the  $G_0$  trajectory.

Since the ( $G_0$  plus Odderon) “Pomeron” state originally, that is before the  $SU(2)$  limit is taken, involves four (or a higher even number) of reggeized gluons, we expect it to be purely even signature. However, given the complicated multiparticle amplitudes in which this configuration couples it is likely that the usual signature rules are violated and that the singularity produced is actually exchange degenerate. As a result the elementary  $G_0$  trajectory will not only be exchange degenerate with the Pomeron trajectory, but the actual physical *odd signature* reggeon will also involve the Odderon condensate. We suspect this is necessary for the overall consistency of the condensate theory we are trying to formulate.

We clearly have already identified crucial features of the Super-Critical Pomeron described in Part I. The most detailed feature of the Super-Critical phase that we would like to identify is the structure of Pomeron vertices produced by the Pomeron condensate. We will not attempt to identify all of this structure explicitly since we feel that further study of the anomalous interactions is still needed. The vacuum production of pairs of

Pomerons is clearly present as a consequence of the pair production of  $G_0$ 's from massless gluon configurations discussed in Section 10 and illustrated in Fig. 10.9. Note that since the  $r_{000}$  coupling does not violate  $SU(2)$  color charge parity it will be generated by quark loops if the quark masses violate  $SU(3)$  symmetry. Indeed we have argued that the  $SU(2)$  singlet quarks should be kept massive as the  $SU(2)$  symmetry is restored (whereas the doublet masses must be set to zero *before* the symmetry limit is taken). If the transverse momentum cut-off is removed via asymptotic freedom then *both* the mass of the  $G_0$  vector meson and the masses of the singlet quarks are physical parameters. These parameters can be used to track both the Pomeron intercept and the intercepts of multiquark reggeon states that are potential pion states.

## 13. THE CRITICAL POMERON, $SU(3)$ GAUGE INVARIANCE AND HIGHER GAUGE GROUPS

In this Section we will outline, how we believe all the features of the Critical Pomeron limit are realised as we restore the  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry (by taking the limit  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$ ) within the description of partially-broken QCD given in the last Section. We shall then go on to discuss the structure for the Pomeron in  $SU(N)$  gauge theories that our analysis implies. We shall be able to relate this directly to the structure of transverse tubes of color flux determined by the center of the gauge group (via 't Hooft commutation relations[23] etc.). This will allow us to understand why a simple Pomeron Regge pole (and hence the Critical Pomeron) is uniquely related to the  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry of QCD.

### 13.1 The $M_2 \rightarrow 0$ Limit and the Transverse Momentum Cut-Off

As we have already discussed we intend to exploit the (“exchange”) degeneracy (12.11) between the Super-Critical Pomeron trajectory and the  $G_0$  trajectory. As the renormalized physical vector gluon trajectory is built up we expect this relation to be preserved by the presence of the reggeon condensate. Following the discussion of Section 7, we anticipate that if the theory is saturated with quarks we can remove the transverse momentum cut-off  $\lambda$  (by exploiting asymptotic freedom) already after the  $M_1 \rightarrow 0$  limit is taken. In this case  $M_2$  can be identified with the physical gluon mass and the limit  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$  is a well-defined (cut-off independent) limit which unambiguously restores  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry and simultaneously gives

$$\alpha_{\mathbb{P}}(0) \xrightarrow{M_2^2 \rightarrow 0} \alpha_{G_0}(M_2^2) = 1 \quad (13.1)$$

There could be a question as to whether the result of this limit is pure  $QCD$ . That is whether the limit (7.11), which we will again employ, is sufficient to decouple the remaining Higgs sector when only the dynamical cut-off provided by asymptotic freedom is present. As we remarked in Section 7, we can only assume that the power-counting argument given there suffices - for at least the leading power high-energy behavior.

Since the reggeon condensate and the  $G_0$  reggeon are only  $SU(2)$  gauge invariant *both must disappear* in the limit  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$ . We have argued that, before the symmetry is restored, the complicated couplings of the Pomeron will give an exchange degenerate singularity.

However, as the symmetry is restored these couplings must collapse into (essentially) local symmetric couplings and so the conventional signature rules should imply that the odd-signature component does indeed decouple. This clearly suggests that all of the essential characteristics of the Critical Pomeron limit will be realised as the  $SU(3)$  gauge symmetry is restored.

We can also take the  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$  limit at a fixed value of  $\lambda$  and many of the arguments for the occurrence of the Critical Pomeron will go through. However, in this case, it is clearly not guaranteed that all consequences of  $SU(3)$  symmetry will follow just from the  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$  limit. We know that  $\lambda$  is a relevant parameter at the Reggeon Field Theory critical point. We shall assume, therefore, that for each number of quark flavors  $N_f$  there is a critical value  $\lambda_c(N_f)$  of  $\lambda$  at which the critical behavior occurs. It will be consistent with the arguments of Section 3 and all decoupling arguments if we assume that  $\lambda < \lambda_c$  gives the Super-Critical theory,  $\lambda > \lambda_c$  gives the Sub-Critical theory,  $\lambda_c$  increases with  $N_f$  and, of course,  $\lambda_c = \infty$  when the theory is saturated.

### 13.2 $C$ - Parity and the Triple Pomeron Vertex

The Pomeron, as a single  $G_0$  reggeized gluon in the condensate background, has a projection on an  $SU(3)$  invariant combination of gluons which is *negative under the  $SU(3)$  color charge conjugation* defined by (9.47), and referred to from now on as  $C$ -parity. That is, in first approximation, the  $SU(3)$  invariant Pomeron is four gluons with the color structure

$$\mathbb{P} = d_{ijk} f_{klm} A^i A^j A^\ell A^m \quad (13.2)$$

The negative  $C$ -parity of (13.2) will be particularly important when we come to discuss the transverse flux tube picture of the Pomeron later in this Section. As we now discuss  $C$ -parity is actually broken by Pomeron interaction vertices although it remains conserved non-locally in Pomeron graphs. In a sense this already determines that the Pomeron is a non-local object in confining  $SU(3)$  gauge theory.

In the last Section we noted that the  $SU(2)$  symmetry limit should be taken with singlet quarks kept massive. To fully restore the  $SU(3)$  symmetry these masses must also be set to zero. Indeed since they are physical particle masses they can be used to ensure that (in the  $SU(3)$  limit the pions discussed in previous Sections do indeed have zero mass. The triangle diagram shown in Fig. 13.1 will contribute to an  $SU(3)$  invariant triple Pomeron

vertex. Before the  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$  limit is taken the condensate lines will be attached out of the transverse plane and the triangle diagram will, following the discussion in Section 10, contain infra-red divergences involving helicity transitions, but will not violate  $SU(2)$  charge parity. As the  $SU(3)$  limit is taken the helicity transitions can produce a  $C$ -parity violating vertex. However, the condensate lines traveling out of the transverse plane will couple in via similar divergences in another part of the reggeon diagram. As a result the condensate lines can produce coupled violations of  $C$ -parity in distinct parts of a complicated reggeon diagram while the overall diagram does not violate the symmetry. If  $SU(3)$   $C$ -parity is indeed only conserved non-locally in Pomeron reggeon diagrams then both Pomeron self-couplings *and Pomeron couplings to external states* will violate the symmetry. This presumably implies that at the physical (glueball) particle poles that would be generated at  $j = 2, 4, \dots$  by the *even signature* Pomeron trajectory, the physical couplings must vanish. That is there will be *no glueball states on the Pomeron trajectory*.

While we have not presented any detailed analysis and have only outlined a classification of diagrams we believe this last discussion does provide an understanding of the basic origin of triple Pomeron interactions. Clearly the existence of interactions is very closely related to the “non-local” nature of the particle states and the Pomeron itself. An important feature of the  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$  limit is the summation of vacuum production graphs, the simplest example of which is shown in Fig. 13.2. As illustrated, such graphs should correspond directly to Super-Critical Pomeron graphs and it should be straightforward to use Pomeron RFT to carry out the summation.

We certainly hope to establish a complete correspondence between the Critical Pomeron limit and  $SU(3)$  symmetry restoration. However, as we already remarked in the last Section, the detailed mapping of the reggeon diagrams of spontaneously-broken  $QCD$  onto Super-Critical Pomeron theory clearly requires a comprehensive treatment of all possible quark loop anomalous interactions. For the moment we are satisfied that we have established a sufficiently close correspondence to leave very little doubt that the mapping can be made.

### 13.3 Symmetry Restoration for Higher Gauge Groups

Consider now  $SU(N)$  gauge theory with  $N > 3$ . The discussion of Section 7 implies that we should initially break the gauge symmetry completely by adding  $(N - 1)$  scalar fields that are fundamental (that is “ $N$ -tuplet”) representations of the gauge group. These should then be decoupled sequentially so that the gauge symmetry is restored through the

sequence

$$SU(1) \xrightarrow{M_1^2 \rightarrow 0} SU(2) \xrightarrow{M_2^2 \rightarrow 0} SU(3) \longrightarrow \cdots \xrightarrow{M_{N-1}^2 \rightarrow 0} SU(N) \quad (13.3)$$

While the  $SU(3)$  limit  $M_2 \rightarrow 0$  can again give the Critical Pomeron, there will also be additional  $SU(3)$  color zero trajectories in the theory as illustrated in Fig. 13.3. For  $SU(N)$  there will be an  $(N-3) \times (N-3)$  matrix of such trajectories. Consequently as further limits  $M_3 \rightarrow 0, M_4 \rightarrow 0$  etc. are taken there will potentially be more complicated critical phenomena involving additional Pomeron Regge trajectories which actually need not all be even signature. We can understand this phenomenon from two very different viewpoints - as we describe in the following sub-sections.

### 13.4 Stability Analysis for Higher Gauge Groups

We begin by discussing the generalization of the stability analysis of Section 3 to  $SU(N)$  gauge theory. If we wish to *retain asymptotic freedom for the complete theory* then we can add no more than  $(N-2)$  fundamental representation scalars[34]. The Higgs mechanism then potentially breaks the gauge symmetry down to  $SU(2)$ . Again, however, the theory must contain close to the maximum number of fermions allowed by asymptotic freedom, even if the symmetry breaking is less than the maximum allowed.

Consider, for example, an  $SU(4)$  theory with the gauge symmetry broken down to  $SU(3)$  only. In this case just one quartet of scalars is added and (3.7) holds for the corresponding coupling constant, except that

$$A = \frac{1}{\pi^2}, \quad B' = \frac{-45}{32\pi^2}, \quad C = \frac{99}{256\pi^2} \quad (13.4)$$

and (for “color quartet” quarks)

$$b_o = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[ \frac{44}{3} - \frac{2}{3} N_f - \frac{1}{6} \right] \quad (13.5)$$

The stability condition now gives

$$\left( 4\pi - 32\pi^2 b_o \right)^2 > 16.99 \quad (13.6)$$

$$\sim 45 - 32\pi^2 b_o > 40 \quad (13.7)$$

$$\Rightarrow \frac{5}{4} > 8\pi^2 b_o = \left[ \frac{44}{3} - \frac{2N_f}{3} - \frac{1}{6} \right] \quad (13.8)$$

The dependence on  $N_F$  is as follows

$$\frac{5}{4} > \left[ N_f = 21 \right] = \frac{1}{2}, \quad \frac{5}{4} > \left[ N_f = 20 \right] = \frac{7}{6}, \quad \frac{5}{4} \not> \left[ N_f = 19 \right] = \frac{11}{6} \quad (13.9)$$

so the first critical point for  $SU(4)$  is reached at  $N_F = 20$ , one less than the maximum allowed for asymptotic freedom of the pure gauge theory. To consider adding more representations of scalars it is necessary to discuss a more complicated set of stability equations. The conclusion is, as we stated in general above, that two representations of scalars, but no more, can be added, allowing the gauge symmetry to be broken to  $SU(2)$ . The original studies[34] did not determine (presumably because it was too complicated) whether both representations can be added at  $N_F = 20$  or only at  $N_F = 21$ . Given the nature of the analysis, it is natural to assume that as  $N_F$  increases more stability conditions are satisfied. This would imply that the gauge symmetry can be broken to  $SU(3)$  at  $N_F = 20$  and to  $SU(2)$  at  $N_F = 21$ , so that there are in effect two critical points. Similarly in  $SU(5)$  the symmetry can be broken to  $SU(4)$  at four flavors less than the maximum, and altogether the symmetry can again be broken only to  $SU(2)$ . It is natural to assume that there are three critical points distinguished by the number of flavors, and so on.

As illustrated in Fig. 13.3, when  $SU(4)$  gauge symmetry is broken to  $SU(2)$  the singlet  $G_0$  that we have discussed for  $QCD$  is replaced by a quartet of reggeized massive vectors which are singlets under the  $SU(2)$  symmetry. This quartet will form exchange degenerate vacuum trajectories as a consequence of the  $SU(2)$  reggeon condensate. If we first restore the  $SU(3)$  symmetry then one of the massive gluon trajectories will be part of an  $SU(3)$  octet and will go to zero mass, giving the Critical Pomeron as in  $QCD$ . Two of the other massive gluons will combine with the  $SU(2)$  doublets  $G_2^i$  to form confined  $SU(3)$  triplets. There will remain a massive reggeized vector which is a singlet under the  $SU(3)$  gauge group. Since it is known that a vector boson trajectory can be left essentially unperturbed by the Critical Pomeron[52] it is reasonable to assume that this singlet trajectory can be taken smoothly to unit intercept. We also have no a priori reason to expect it to decouple from either the Pomeron or the physical spectrum. We are therefore led to believe that the critical phenomenon as  $SU(2)$  gauge symmetry is restored to  $SU(4)$  involves an odd signature trajectory contributing to the Pomeron in addition to an even signature trajectory. This is

the case for  $N_F = 21$ . For  $N_F = 20$  the symmetry can only be broken to  $SU(3)$  and so only one gauge vector trajectory can be brought into the spectrum by the Higgs mechanism. We take this to imply that the even signature Pomeron is still critical but that in this case the odd-signature component has intercept less than one.

As we have implied we can generalize this analysis to higher gauge groups by again beginning with  $SU(2)$  gauge symmetry realised via the reggeon condensate. The obvious generalization of the above discussion would lead to the conclusion that when the asymptotic freedom constraint on the number of quarks is saturated there will be a critical phenomenon involving many Pomeron trajectories of both signatures. In particular the above arguments suggest that in  $SU(N)$  gauge theory there will be  $(N - 2)$  such trajectories. As the number of quark flavors is reduced these trajectories will move successively away from unit intercept (at each critical value of the number of flavors), with the even signature Critical Pomeron presumably the last to go. It is clear from the above analysis that the spectrum of Pomeron trajectories is closely related to the *center* (or “diagonal part”) of the gauge group. This picture becomes particularly attractive when we interpret it in terms of the flux loop structure of gauge theories *when such loops are projected on a transverse plane*. This structure is also determined by the center of the gauge group.

### 13.5 Transverse Color Flux Tubes

As we already alluded to in Section 7, it is a common expectation that the confining solution of a gauge theory can be at least approximated by (if not exactly described by) a string theory in which the “string” is a “tube” of color flux. (Indeed dual models and then string theories were developed originally as Regge region approximations and it is presumably in this kinematic regime that a string approximation to QCD has the most validity.) It is also a very familiar idea that with an ultra-violet cut-off (and on the lattice in particular) we can approximate the operator that creates a flux-tube by a line-integral of the form of (7.6). In this case a “closed-string” will be created by the (fixed-time) Wilson loop operator

$$\phi(\Omega) = Tr \left[ P \exp -g \int_{\Omega} dx_{\mu} A_{\mu}(x) \right] \quad (13.10)$$

where  $\Omega$  is the closed-curve around which the string lies. Indeed we argued in Section 7 that if we exploit complementarity we anticipate the smooth formation of “string states” from perturbative states. The exchange of a closed string - *which in a hadronic string theory gives*



the Pomeron - will be related to the propagator

$$\langle \phi(\Omega_1) \phi(\Omega_2) \rangle \quad (13.11)$$

If we suppose that this propagator contains a Regge pole (“bound-state”) Pomeron *and perturbation theory has some validity* we might expect the vector nature of the gluon to give a scattering amplitude which has an approximation of the form

$$A(\langle \phi(\Omega_1) \phi(\Omega_2) \rangle) \sim s \langle \phi(\Omega_{1T}) \phi(\Omega_{2T}) \rangle_T \quad (13.12)$$

where  $\Omega_{1T}$  and  $\Omega_{2T}$  are transverse projections of  $\Omega_1$  and  $\Omega_2$  and  $\langle \quad \rangle_T$  is a transverse propagator evaluated from some (suitably complicated) set of transverse momentum diagrams. That is we effectively ignore all the powers of  $\ln s$  generated, or equivalently, assume they simply cancel out (which is almost the case when the Pomeron is Critical).

Next we note that the  $C$ - parity operation of (9.47) is equivalent to a transformation within  $\phi(\Omega)$

$$A_{\alpha\beta}^i \longrightarrow A_{\beta\alpha}^i, \quad dx_\mu \longrightarrow -dx_\mu \quad (13.13)$$

and so reverses the direction of the loop integration. Because  $\phi(\Omega)$  is a trace of hermitian (color) matrices this says that the  $C$ - parity transformation is equivalent to hermitian conjugation of  $\phi(\Omega)$ . Also to define signatred amplitudes we add or subtract the amplitude obtained by interchanging one incoming and outgoing particle. This produces the kinematic effect that  $s \rightarrow -s$  and (where the interchanged particles are attached) produces, via the reversal of quark lines, the reversal of the orientation in (13.10). It then follows that even and odd-signatred amplitudes should be obtained from (13.12) by

$$A^+ \sim s \langle \text{Im} \phi(\Omega_{1T}) \text{Im} \phi(\Omega_{2T}) \rangle \quad (13.14)$$

$$A^- \sim s \langle \text{Re} \phi(\Omega_{1T}) \text{Re} \phi(\Omega_{2T}) \rangle \quad (13.15)$$

Hence the even-signatred amplitude defined from a (Wilson-loop) closed string involves the imaginary part of the loop operator and hence *odd C- parity exchange*. That is the Pomeron we have found perturbatively has *the right C- parity to be identified with the even-signatred exchange of a color flux-tube*.

Once we have made the identification (13.14) and (13.15) we can immediately understand the complete structure of Pomeron trajectories that we obtained in the last sub-section

in terms of the orientability properties of transverse line integrals - as determined by the center of the gauge group.

### 13.6 Closed Loop Integrals and the Center of the Gauge Group

For  $SU(2)$  gauge theory the line integral (13.10) is necessarily real because it is the trace of an  $SU(2)$  matrix and all  $SU(2)$  matrices have real trace. Or - what is essentially the same property -  $SU(2)$  line integrals can not be given an orientation because of the equivalence of the 2 and  $2^*$  representations of  $SU(2)$ . As a result it immediately follows from (13.14) that there will not be an even signature Pomeron in  $SU(2)$  gauge theory. Since a simple closed string coupling is inevitably even signature (because of the symmetry under rotation by  $\pi$ ) this implies *there is no Pomeron in  $SU(2)$  gauge theory*. A somewhat remarkable independent confirmation of the perturbative infra-red analysis of previous Sections.

For  $SU(3)$  gauge theory it is the fact that line integrals have an orientation, as illustrated in Fig. 13.4, which leads to the identification of the even signature Pomeron with the amplitude for the exchange of a “closed-string” configuration with negative  $C$  - parity. However, the symmetry of the closed loop under rotation by  $\pi$  again implies that there is no odd-signature amplitude. Therefore the  $SU(3)$  “closed string Pomeron” has exactly the properties determined by our perturbative analysis.

In  $SU(N)$  gauge theory the distinct transverse loop operators that can be defined, *when there are no quarks in the theory*, are determined by starting from the general commutation relations[23] for three-dimensional Wilson loop (electric flux) operators with (magnetic flux) ’t Hooft loop operators when the loops intertwine. The result is that we can obtain distinct operators as limits into the transverse plane of loops with any number of windings less than  $N$ . However, a loop with  $N - n$  windings will give the inverse of the operator with  $n$  windings, which from (13.13) is simply the same operator but with the inverse orientation. (Note that this discussion is only valid when quarks are not present in the theory. Nevertheless we might expect that this would be the appropriate place to start with a flux-tube picture of the Pomeron and that the only relevance of quarks would be in their contributions to Pomeron interaction vertices.)

For  $SU(4)$  gauge theory it is possible to define not only orientation dependent single loop operators but also a “double-loop” operator  $\phi_2(\Omega)$  defined on a transverse “loop” which encircles the same spacial loop twice. As illustrated in Fig. 13.5, this operator is defined

via a limit of a three dimensional loop.  $\phi_2(\omega)$  will be *orientation independent*, and therefore real, but the coupling to an open string will not be symmetric under rotation by  $\pi$ . As a result this operator will give an *odd-signature* component to the Pomeron via (13.15). For  $SU(4)$  gauge theory, therefore, we also conclude that the structure of the Pomeron is just as we concluded from the infra-red analysis.

Moving on to  $SU(5)$  we can now define an orientation dependent  $\phi_2(\omega)$  and as a result we anticipate an extra *even signature* Pomeron trajectory will contribute to (13.14). For  $SU(N)$  we can define  $N - 1$  independent loop operators on a single space loop as illustrated in Fig. 13.6. As a result we expect  $N - 2$  Pomeron trajectories in  $SU(N)$  gauge theory, just as we found in the last sub-section.

We have focussed on the transverse loop operators that can be defined on a single space loop even though, for example, the  $SU(4)$  two-loop operator we have discussed is smoothly related to a general crossed double loop operator as illustrated in Fig. 13.7. We believe that we can think of the above discussion as directly relating to the reggeon diagram infra-red analysis of previous Sections if we consider the single space loop as the “circle at infinity” in the transverse plane (or equivalently at zero transverse momentum). Complementarity is therefore allowing us to build up the possible infra-red structure of flux-tubes directly by a (very complex) perturbative analysis in which, of course, the infra-red contribution of the anomaly plays a crucial role. Clearly the anomaly and the development of the reggeon condensate plays a bridging role in the coexistence of apparently very different perturbative and non-perturbative pictures of the Pomeron.

If we broaden the above discussion to include multi-loop configurations (in transverse space) then the above arguments imply that in general we should think of connected multi-loop operators as distinct from multiple disconnected loop operators and as generating new Pomeron trajectories. We can give a much more physical description of this conclusion if we go back to the phenomenological formulation of Reggeon Field Theory in terms of multiplicity fluctuations and the *RFT* cutting rules described in Section 6 of Part I.

### 13.7 The Center of the Gauge Group, Cutting Rules and Unitarity

We now consider the structure of the  $s$ -channel intermediate states making up the string configurations discussed in the last sub-section. The “world sheet” for the scattering process in which two open string hadrons scatter by the exchange of a closed string Pomeron

is illustrated in Fig. 13.8. The closed string propagation may, of course, involve splitting and joining an arbitrary number of times so that cutting the world sheet to expose intermediate states gives the familiar result of Fig. 13.9 - that is the multiperipheral production of multiple open string states.

It is hard to represent adequately in a figure, but we now consider cutting the corresponding world sheet for propagation of the  $SU(4)$  double-loop created by the  $\phi_2(\omega)$  operator. As illustrated in Fig. 13.10, we will apparently obtain the same result as from cutting the world sheet for the propagation of two closed strings of the form of Fig. 13.9. Indeed, if we consider the phenomenological formulation of *RFT* discussed in Part I, in the context of a closed string model of the Pomeron, we would start with the assumption that single closed string propagation corresponds to single Pomeron exchange and so gives a good description of average multiplicity events. According to this formulation, events with twice the average multiplicity should be directly associated with two Pomeron exchange and therefore with the propagation of two (distinct) closed strings. However, the cutting of the world sheet for propagation of the  $SU(4)$  double-loop shows that “double multiplicity” events can actually be associated with a “new” string configuration and hence a new Pomeron trajectory. If we extend this argument to  $SU(N)$  gauge theory it is straightforward to see that events with up to  $N - 2$  times the average multiplicity events actually generate new Pomeron trajectories.

Note that if we sew two open strings together to form a closed string as illustrated in Fig. 13.10(a) we obtain an elementary representation of how *s*-channel unitarity is anticipated to work in the simplest string model of the Pomeron. In the “string model” associated with  $SU(4)$  gauge theory we must allow the center of the gauge group to be represented in the nature of closed string formation via unitarity, and include the process illustrated in Fig. 13.10(b). For  $SU(N)$  gauge theory, this implies that the corresponding “cut” *RFT* would have to involve not only  $N - 2$  Pomeron trajectories but also a representation of the center  $Z_N$ . Indeed it is straightforward to show that the ‘+’, ‘-’, and ‘cut’ Pomeron Greens functions of the cut RFT described in Part I do provide a representation of  $Z_3$  - the center of  $SU(3)$ .

### 13.8 The Critical Pomeron Phenomena of $SU(N)$ Gauge Theory, Unitarity, and the Parton Model.

We close by summarizing what we think is a rather beautiful picture of the Critical Phenomena which can, in principle, occur in a general gauge theory as we come close to

saturating the theory with quarks. At the first critical number of flavors (determined by the lowest number which allows an asymptotically-free Higgs field to be added to the theory) the simple closed loop Pomeron becomes Critical - that is has intercept one. At the next critical value the double-loop odd-signature Pomeron becomes critical, at the next value the double-loop even signature Pomeron becomes critical and so on, until all possible multi-loop Pomeron trajectories are critical - giving a full representation of the center of the gauge group in the high-energy solution of unitarity.

Whether all of the phenomena we have just described can be consistent with unitarity is a deep question. We know, as we strongly emphasized in Part I, that the  $SU(3)$  even signature Critical Pomeron satisfies all known unitarity constraints. Although axiomatic bounds would allow the odd signature “Critical Odderon” which is apparently present in all the phenomena associated with higher gauge groups, these bounds are derived with very little exploitation of multiparticle  $s$ -channel unitarity. The general issue might be related to another, superficially distinct, but equally deep question. That is whether such phenomena can be consistent with an asymptotically-free short-distance description of the theory in terms of a “parton-model”. Confinement and chiral symmetry breaking are complicated vacuum properties that are presumably essential to obtain a unitary description of a strongly-interacting theory in the infra-red region. However, these vacuum properties can not totally disappear at infinite momentum. This can probably be reconciled with the simple vacuum of the parton model only if, in Feynman’s language[53], there is a “*universal wee-parton distribution*” which can act like a vacuum and carry the chiral symmetry breaking property in particular. But the wee-parton distribution is only truly universal if the Pomeron is a single Pomeron Regge pole, with unit intercept[54], as it is *only in flavor-saturated QCD!* This brings us to the general subject of the relationship of all of our results to the physical world, and in particular the consistency of the Parton Model with the  $N_F$  dependence of the Pomeron in QCD. This is the subject of the final Section.

## 14. IMPLICATIONS FOR THE REAL WORLD

In this Section we shall briefly discuss a range of topics involving the relationship of our results to current theoretical ideas about QCD and the Standard model as well as to the current experimental status of the Pomeron. We begin with the implications of our results for  $QCD$  with a small number of flavors and the perhaps surprising consistency with experimental results.

### 14.1 The Pomeron at Present Collider Energies

We shall be particularly brief here since the topic really deserves a separate article - which we hope to prepare in the near future. The results of the last Section imply that for a small number of flavors (say five or six) the Critical Pomeron will occur at some fixed value  $\lambda_c$  of the transverse momentum cut-off. Increasing the cut-off above this value gives the Sub-Critical Pomeron while a decrease gives the Super-Critical Pomeron.

It is interesting that, as we emphasized in Part I, the  $O(\epsilon)$  Critical Diffraction peak[55] closely resembles that seen at the ISR - that is over the energy range where the rise of the cross-section first becomes apparent. (The  $0(\epsilon^2)$  result[56], which is not necessarily an improvement on the  $0(\epsilon)$  result, is also relatively close to the diffraction pattern seen at the ISR). At first sight it is (and has been) surprising and discouraging that this agreement gets worse rather than better as the energy increases. However, our current understanding of the role of the transverse cut-off now makes this explicable. There are a number of phenomenological models[57] which attribute the violations of Regge behavior seen at the CERN  $Sp\bar{p}S$  and the Fermilab Tevatron - particularly the “large  $t$  shoulder” of the diffraction peak - to the contribution of large  $p_\perp$  processes. This appears consistent with the idea that we could recover the Critical Pomeron by removing the contribution of all production processes involving  $p_\perp > \lambda_c$ . We shall return to the question of whether it is consistent to treat processes with  $p_\perp > \lambda_c$  using perturbative  $QCD$  (as has been successful phenomenologically) after we have discussed the possibility that higher colored quarks could be responsible for electroweak symmetry breaking.

Another result which follows from our analysis is the approximate validity of the “Additive Quark Model” result for total cross-sections. We have not discussed just how to consistently implement the transverse cut-off. But, however this is done, variations in

the cut-off should not significantly affect the magnitude of the forward elastic amplitude. This implies we can obtain a good approximation to this amplitude by going deep into the Super-Critical Phase where the Pomeron can be described by a single reggeized gluon coupling to an individual quark. Clearly we also obtain the extended version of the additive quark model in which there is a “Pomeron/photon analogy”. That is the Pomeron has a simple vector coupling to quarks. The Pomeron/photon analogy is also very successful phenomenologically[28].

## 14.2 Should $QCD$ Be Defined Via the Saturated Massless Version?

Taken at face value, our results provide a conflict with much of the conventional wisdom of  $QCD$ . Apparently, if the theory is not saturated with quarks, then the cross-section for low momentum transfer processes ultimately goes to zero asymptotically. This appears to conflict with the requirement that there be a smooth match with large momentum transfer processes that are calculable via the parton model and perturbative  $QCD$ , since such cross-sections certainly do not go to zero asymptotically. It is perhaps conceivable that large transverse momentum processes completely dominate at high-energy with the average transverse momentum being very large and ever-increasing. However, it should be clear, from Part I in particular, that we believe this would produce a theory that is inconsistent with (Reggeon) Unitarity. (This argument is also elaborated in [58]). There is no such conflict if the theory is saturated with quarks since Critical Pomeron scaling can smoothly connect with perturbative  $QCD$  at large transverse momentum.

The conventional wisdom is certainly that  $QCD$  can be defined as a continuum theory with any (small) number of flavors. Underlying the field of computational lattice  $QCD$  is the assumption that, because of confinement, the theory is insensitive to boundary conditions and the infinite volume limit. However, the presence of gauge fields with non-trivial topology implies that the question of whether or not a non-zero “ $\theta$ -parameter” is introduced by the combination of the infinite volume limit with the boundary conditions is a non-trivial problem[59]. In the massless (chiral) limit fields with non-trivial topology can produce a coupling between internally localised fermion zero-modes and those in the neighbourhood of the boundary. As a result the correct treatment of boundary conditions and the infinite-volume limit could be a much deeper issue than is acknowledged in the conventional wisdom. An infra-red stable effective lagrangian which can successfully define a version of confining  $QCD$  which is both insensitive to the infra-red volume limit and asymptotically-free has, of

course, not been derived. In fact, there exists a minority opinion[60] that infinite volume lattice  $QCD$  will, if it exists, not be asymptotically-free. In a sense this parallels our arguments - that in general a confining solution of the theory, in the Regge region, does not match with short-distance perturbation theory.

It may be that the only well-defined infinite-volume limit is (a much more subtle) one in which quarks are massless so that there is no dependence on the  $\theta$ -parameter, the infra-red and ultra-violet behavior of the gauge coupling is controlled by fixed points, and boundary conditions based on spectral flow are utilised (as in the solution of the Schwinger model described in Section 11). Given the solution of this theory (which is, of course, the “saturated  $QCD$ ” that we have been discussing) it could be that mass effects can be consistently added, via some form of chiral perturbation theory, in a manner which does not introduce a non-zero  $\theta$ -parameter. This would be analagous to the construction of the massive Schwinger model, as discussed in Section 11. This leads us to ask whether there might not be a further massive quark sector in  $QCD$  and brings us to the next topic.

### 14.3 Color Sextet Quarks, Electroweak Symmetry Breaking and the $\Theta$ - Parameter

There is clearly very little basis for proposing that ten more flavors of very massive color triplet quarks exist. However, as we noted in Section 3, two flavors of color sextet quarks would also produce exactly the effect we want (that is when added to six flavors of conventional triplet quarks). From the perspective of this article, therefore, it is a remarkable coincidence that two flavors of color sextet quarks can provide[29] a natural form of dynamical symmetry-breaking for the electroweak interaction which meshes perfectly with the observed experimental features. Indeed this provides a self-contained motivation for introducing the higher color quark sector which we can briefly outline as follows.

Consider adding to the Standard Model (with no scalar Higgs sector), a massless flavor doublet  $(U, D)$  of color sextet quarks with the *usual quark quantum numbers*, except that the role of quarks and antiquarks is interchanged. For the  $SU(2) \otimes U(1)$  anomaly to be cancelled there must also be other fermions with electroweak quantum numbers added to the theory[29], but we shall not consider this here. We consider first the QCD interaction of the massless sextet quark sector. There is a  $U(2) \otimes U(2)$  chiral flavor symmetry. The chiral dynamics we have discussed in previous Sections will break the axial symmetries spontaneously and produce four massless pseudoscalar mesons (Goldstone bosons), which



we denote as  $\pi_6^+$ ,  $\pi_6^-$ ,  $\pi_6^0$  and  $\eta_6$ , in analogy with the usual notation for mesons composed of  $u$  and  $d$  color triplet quarks.

As long as all quarks are massless, QCD is necessarily  $CP$  conserving in both the sextet and triplet quark sectors. Therefore, in the massless theory we can, in analogy with the familiar treatment of flavor isospin in the triplet quark sector, define sextet quark vector and axial-vector currents  $V_\mu^\tau$  and  $A_\mu^\tau$  which are “isotriplets” under the unbroken  $SU(2)$  vector flavor symmetry and singlet currents  $v_\mu$ ,  $a_\mu$ . The pseudoscalar mesons couple “longitudinally” to the axial currents, that is

$$\langle 0 | A_\mu^\tau | \pi_6^\tau(q) \rangle \sim F_{\pi_6} q_\mu \quad (14.1)$$

$$\langle 0 | a_\mu | \eta_6(q) \rangle \sim F_{\eta_6} q_\mu \quad (14.2)$$

while the vector currents remain conserved. (Note that  $a_\mu$  should actually contain a small admixture of the triplet quark flavor singlet axial current if it is to generate the  $U(1)$  symmetry orthogonal to that broken by the QCD  $U(1)$  anomaly).

We consider next the coupling of the electroweak gauge fields to the sextet quark sector. The massless  $SU(2)$  gauge fields  $W_\mu^\tau$  couple to the isotriplet sextet quark currents in the standard manner, that is

$$\mathcal{L}_I = g W^{\tau\mu} (V_\mu^\tau - A_\mu^\tau) \quad (14.3)$$

It then follows that the  $\pi_6^+$ ,  $\pi_6^-$  and  $\pi_6^0$  are “eaten” by the  $SU(2)$  gauge bosons and (after the hypercharge interaction is included) respectively become the third components of the  $W^+$ ,  $W^-$  and  $Z^0$ . Consequently, QCD chiral symmetry breaking generates masses for the  $W^+$ ,  $W^-$  and  $Z^0$  with  $M_W \sim g F_{\pi_6}$  where  $F_{\pi_6}$  is a *QCD scale*. We anticipate that the relative scales of triplet and sextet chiral symmetry breaking are determined by the “Casimir Scaling” rule[29]

$$C_6 \alpha_s(F_{\pi_6}^2) \sim C_3 \alpha_s(F_\pi^2) \quad (14.4)$$

which is consistent with  $F_{\pi_6} \sim 250$  GeV!

We conclude that a sextet sector of *QCD* produces a special version of “technicolor” symmetry breaking in which the electroweak scale is naturally explained as a second *QCD* scale. Also since we are completely restricted to a flavor doublet the form of the symmetry-breaking is automatically equivalent to that of an  $SU(2)$  Higgs sector and so

$$\rho = (M_W^2/M_Z^2 \cos^2 \theta_W) = 1 \quad (14.5)$$

as required by experiment. Therefore introducing a sextet quark sector not only produces a matching of the asymptotic freedom and confinement properties of  $QCD$  via the Critical Pomeron, but also gives a natural solution to the major problem of today's Standard Model i.e. the nature of electroweak symmetry breaking. The sextet sector may, as we now discuss, also be deeply tied up[61] with the issue of Strong  $CP$  conservation and the very definition of  $QCD$  in the infinite volume limit that we have touched on above.

The  $\eta_6$  is not involved in generating mass for the electroweak gauge bosons, but instead remains as a Goldstone boson associated with a  $U(1)$  axial chiral symmetry. It is therefore an axion[62] in the original sense of the Peccei-Quinn mechanism[63] and it remains massless until triplet quark masses are added to the theory. In the present context, this involves the addition of triplet/sextet four-fermion couplings (that should ultimately be traceable to a larger unifying gauge group), which, when combined with the sextet quark condensate, provide triplet quark masses as illustrated in Fig. 14.1. That  $CP$  remains conserved by QCD triplet quark interactions follows from the original Peccei-Quinn argument utilising the sextet axial  $U(1)$  symmetry.

It can be argued[61] that the  $\eta_6$  will acquire an electroweak scale mass as a result of electroweak scale color instanton interactions and that it may have actually been seen at LEP and at TRISTAN. This would, of course, be very exciting confirmation of the existence of the sextet sector. A further point that we wish to emphasise, however, is that not only may the sextet sector be the explanation (via the  $\eta_6$ ) of Strong  $CP$  conservation in the triplet sector, but it may be a necessary ingredient in introducing masses consistently into  $QCD$ . That the  $\theta$ -parameter is zero for the low-mass sector of the theory could well be essential for the existence of a purely *even signature* Critical Pomeron and the consistency that this provides with unitarity in the Regge region. It seems that this is naturally achieved by introducing two different color quark sectors with the higher color sector automatically having the higher mass scale. (Note that this does not prevent the sextet sector from being  $CP$ -violating at “low-energy”[61]).

A further property that could be part of the need for two different color quark sectors is the rather complicated set of fermion vertices that is generated by instanton interactions. Because of the distinct Casimirs involved, the singlet current

$$J_\mu^0 = a_\mu^6 - 5a_\mu^3 \quad (14.6)$$

is conserved in the presence of instantons (6 and 3 now denote sextet and triplet currents respectively). Consequently the minimum instanton interaction involves one quark/antiquark pair of each triplet flavor and five pairs of each sextet flavor. Combining this interaction with the existence of both sextet and triplet chiral condensates (and, eventually, four-fermion vertices coupling triplets and sextets) a wide assortment of fermion vertices is produced whose magnitude is difficult to estimate. It could be that this complexity is actually required if the quark loop anomalies we have discussed are to smoothly reproduce the effects of instanton interactions in the Regge limit - as we have argued should be the case.

If the sextet sector is indeed hidden at short distances then we can easily reconcile our results and overall picture with the existing successes of both perturbative and lattice *QCD*. The decoupling theorem[64] assures us that, at least in short-distance expansions, we can integrate out the higher sextet mass scale and apply *QCD* perturbation theory at current momentum scales with only the triplet sector included. Since the infra-red fixed point value of  $\alpha_s$  that we expect to dominate dynamics above the sextet scale is given by (3.14) there is no problem, at least in principle, with the idea that integrating out the sextet scale simply increases  $\alpha_s$  from  $1/33$  to about  $1/8$ . Clearly finite size lattice calculations (of many quantities) should also remain insensitive to the higher mass sector. This sector would only be relevant if the full subtleties of the interplay between the infinite volume, chiral and continuum limits are discussed.

With respect to the Pomeron phenomenology discussed above, the implications of the sextet sector would be as follows. Accepting that the Critical Pomeron can be essentially produced at the ISR by appropriate adjustment of the transverse momentum cut-off (well) below the sextet scale, we would anticipate that conventional perturbative *QCD* can be used above the cut-off. Thus two-component “soft” plus “hard” models will adequately fit the data[57] at the ISR and immediately higher energies. However, since the “perturbative” *QCD* component actually contains sextet quark Regge contributions which will emerge distinctively at much higher energies it could well be that the large  $t$  shoulder, for example, can both be described by the “perturbative” Pomeron and be associated with diffractive production of the  $\eta_6$ [65].

## 14.5 Unification and the Super-Critical Pomeron

Finally we comment on the possible relevance of the Super-Critical Pomeron and the discussion of higher gauge groups in the last Section, to the unification of *QCD* and the elec-

troweak interaction. First we note that the inclusion of sextet quarks, when combined with the requirement of asymptotic freedom, very severely restricts the possible unification groups. Asking for an anomaly-free, asymptotically-free, representation containing the two flavors of sextets, isolates a very special  $SU(5)$  representation[66] (and an  $SO(10)$  representation that contains the  $SU(5)$  representation). It is very interesting that the  $SU(5)$  representation “saturates” the asymptotic freedom requirement, just as we have been discussing for  $QCD$ .

According to the arguments of the previous Section, the  $SU(5)$  theory should contain a generalised Critical Pomeron phenomenon involving additional even and odd signature Pomeron trajectories. (Note, however, that the question as to whether left-handed gauge theories can be treated by the methods we have developed could be an additional issue.) It is attractive to speculate that such a phenomenon is indeed inconsistent with unitarity as we discussed and that the theory is forced to break dynamically via the development of a reggeon (winding-number) condensate. If the condensate develops with respect to a (gauge-dependent) subgroup, as we have discussed, it would have the group structure

$$d_{ijk}f_{jlm}A^kA^lA^m \tag{14.7}$$

and so, being in the adjoint representation of the gauge group, would break the symmetry to the desired  $SU(3) \otimes SU(2) \otimes U(1)$ . In effect this would be saying that the regularisation of the fermion sea necessarily breaks the symmetry in order to satisfy unitarity. A generalised version of the Super-Critical Pomeron, containing the Critical Pomeron, would be the appropriate description of the vector-boson spectrum. The Critical Pomeron will produce the sextet and triplet chiral symmetry breaking, as we have discussed. Whether a consistent low-energy mass spectrum might then emerge is, of course, a very big question. We end, therefore, with the intriguing conclusion that studying the “Pomeron” in a unified gauge theory may actually be a direct way to uncover the dynamical spectrum of the theory.

# References

- [1] A. R. White, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A11**, 1859 (1991), referred to as Part I throughout the present paper.
- [2] N. S. Manton, Ann. Phys. **159**, 220 (1985).
- [3] H. F. Contopanagos and M. B. Einhorn, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 1322 (1992).
- [4] A. S. Gorsky, B. L. Ioffe and A. Yu. Khodjamirin, Phys. Letts. **B227**, 474 (1989).
- [5] A. A. Migdal, A. M. Polyakov and K. A. Ter-Martirosyan, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **67**, 84 (1974); H. D. I. Abarbanel and J. B. Bronzan, Phys. Rev. **D9**, 2397 (1974).
- [6] G. F. Chew and S. Frautschi, Phys. Rev. Letts. **7**, 394 (1961).
- [7] G. V. Frolov, V. N. Gribov and L. N. Lipatov, Phys. Lett. **B31**, 34 (1970), H. Cheng and T. T. Wu, Phys. Rev. Letts. **24**, 1456 (1970).
- [8] M. GellMann, M. L. Goldberger, F. E. Low, E. Marx and F. Zachariasen, Phys. Rev. **135B**, 145 (1964), S. Mandelstam, Phys. Rev. **137B**, 949 (1965).
- [9] R. C. Brower, C. E. DeTar and J. H. Weis, Phys. Rpts **14C**, 257 (1974); A. R. White in *Structural Analysis of Collision Amplitudes*, proceedings of the Les Houches Institute, eds. R. Balian and D. Iagolnitzer (North Holland, 1976).
- [10] V. N. Gribov, Soviet Phys. JETP **26**, 414 (1968); H. D. I. Abarbanel, J. B. Bronzan, R. L. Sugar and A. R. White, Phys. Rpts. **21C**, 119 (1975).
- [11] C. Lovelace, Phys. Letts. **34B**, 500 (1971).
- [12] E. A. Kuraev, L. N. Lipatov and V. S. Fadin, Sov. Phys. JETP **44**, 443 (1976) and **45**, 199 (1977);
- [13] H. Cheng and C. Y. Lo, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 1131 (1976) and **D15**, 2959 (1977).
- [14] L. N. Lipatov, in *Perturbative QCD* edited by A. H. Mueller, (World Scientific, 1989).

- [15] For example: L. V. Gribov, E. M. Levin and M. G. Ryskin, Phys. Rpts. **100C**, 1 (1983); A. H. Mueller and H. Navelet, Nucl. Phys. **B282**, 727 (1987); R. K. Ellis and D. A. Ross, Nucl. Phys. **B345**, 79 (1990); for a general review see J. Bartels, Particle World **2**, 46 (1991).
- [16] Ya. Ya. Balitskii and L. N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **28**, 822 (1978).
- [17] A. H. Mueller Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **18C**, 125 (1991).
- [18] A. H. Mueller and W. K. Tang, Phys. Letts. **B284**, 123 (1992).
- [19] J. Bartels, Nucl. Phys. **B151**, 293 (1979), **B175**, 365 (1980) and DESY preprint DESY 91-074.
- [20] J. C. Collins and R. K. Ellis, Nucl. Phys B (Proc. Suppl.) **18C**, 80 (1991).
- [21] M. T. Grisaru and H. J. Schnitzer, Phys. Rev. **D20**, 784 (1979).
- [22] See, for example, A. R. White in *Hadronic Multiparticle Production* edited by P. Carruthers (World Scientific, 1988), in *Gauge Theories of Fundamental Interactions* edited by M. Pawlowski and R. Raczka (World Scientific, 1990) and references therein.
- [23] G. 't Hooft, Nucl. Phys. **B138**, 1 (1978).
- [24] A. Sen, Phys. Rev. **D27**, 2997 (1983) and, unfortunately, unpublished work on non-abelian theories.
- [25] E. Fradkin and S. H. Shenker, Phys. Rev. **D19**, 3682 (1979); T. Banks and E. Rabinovici, Nucl. Phys. **B160**, 349 (1979).
- [26] V. S. Fadin and V. E. Sherman, Sov. Phys. JETP **45**, 861 (1978).
- [27] C. E. DeTar and J. H. Weiss, Phys. Rev. **D4**, 3141 (1971); H. D. I. Abarbanel, J. Bartels, J. B. Bronzan and D. Sidhu, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 2459 (1975).
- [28] P. V. Landshoff, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.), **12**, 397 (1990).
- [29] W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 2425 (1980); E. Braaten, A. R. White and C. R. Wilcox, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A1**, 693 (1986).

- [30] M. Ciafaloni, G. Marchesini and G. Veneziano, Nucl. Phys. **B98**, 472 (1975).
- [31] T. Gaisser and C-I. Tan, Phys. Rev. D8, 3881 (1973); J. W. Dash, E. Manesis and S. T. Jones, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 303 (1978).
- [32] R. L. Sugar and A. R. White, Phys. Rev. **D10**, 4074 (1974).
- [33] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 3633 (1973).
- [34] T. P. Cheng, E. Eichten and L. F. Li, Phys. Rev. **D9**, 2259 (1974).
- [35] O. V. Tarasov, A. A. Vladimirov and A. Yu Zharkov, Phys. Letts. **93B**, 429 (1980).
- [36] T. Banks and A. Zaks, Nucl. Phys. **B196**, 189 (1982).
- [37] G. 't Hooft, in “The Whys of Subnuclear Physics”, Erice Lectures, ed.A. Zichichi (Plenum Press, New York 1977); G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. **B150**, 163 (1979).
- [38] F. David, Nucl. Phys. **B209**, 433 (1982) and B234, 237 (1984); A. H. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. **B250**, 327 (1985).
- [39] P. V. Landshoff and O. Nachtmann, Z. Physik **35**, 405 (1987).
- [40] B. M. McCoy and T. T. Wu, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 369, 379, 424, 484, 508 (1976).
- [41] J. B. Bronzan and R. L. Sugar, Phys. Rev. **D17**, 585 (1978).
- [42] S. J. Chang and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **188**, 2385 (1969).
- [43] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **140B**, 516 (1965).
- [44] D. R. Yennie, S. C. Frautschi and H. Suura, Ann. Phys. **B13**, 379 (1961).
- [45] V. N. Gribov, Phys. Lett. **B194**, 119 (1987).
- [46] J. Kwiecinski, Phys. Rev. **D26**, 3293 (1982).
- [47] H. Cheng and T. T. Wu, Phys. Rev. **D1**, 2775 (1970).
- [48] G. 't Hooft, in Recent Developments in Gauge Theories, ed. G. 't Hooft et al. (Plenum, N.Y., 1980); T. Banks, Y. Frishman, A. Schwimmer and S. Yankielowicz, Nucl. Phys. **B177**, 157 (1981); S. Coleman and B. Grossman, Nucl. Phys. **B203**, 205 (1982).

- [49] J. Frohlich and E. Seiler, *Helv. Phys. Acta* **49**, 889 (1976), S. Coleman, R. Jackiw and L. Susskind, *Ann. Phys.* **93**, 267 (1975).
- [50] J. B. Kogut and L. Susskind, *Phys. Rev.* **D11**, 395 (1974).
- [51] Y. Frishman, *Springer Lecture Notes in Physics*, Vol. **32**, (1975).
- [52] H. D. I. Abarbanel and R. L. Sugar, *Phys. Rev.* **D10**, 721 (1974).
- [53] R. P. Feynman, *Photon Hadron Interactions* (Benjamin, New York 1972).
- [54] A. R. White, *Phys. Rev.* **D29**, 1435 (1984).
- [55] H. D. I. Abarbanel, J. Bartels, J. B. Bronzan and D. Sidhu, *Phys. Rev.* **D12**, 2798 (1978).
- [56] M. Baig, J. Bartels and J. W. Dash, *Nucl. Phys.* **B237**, 502 (1984).
- [57] M. M. Block, K. Kang and A. R. White, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A7**, 4449 (1992).
- [58] A. R. White, *Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. suppl.)* **12**, 190 (1990).
- [59] G. Morchio and F. Strocchi, *Proceedings of “Fields and Particles”*, Schladming, Austria (Springer-Verlag 1990).
- [60] A. Patrascioiu and E. Seiler, *Plenary Talk, Lattice '92, Amsterdam, MPI-Ph/PTh 102/92*.
- [61] I. G. Knowles, K. Kang and A. R. White, *ANL-HEP-PR-93-4/BROWN-HET-872*.
- [62] S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 223 (1978); F. Wilczek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 279 (1978).
- [63] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440 (1977).
- [64] T. Appelquist and J. Carrazone, *Phys. Rev.* **D11**, 2856 (1975).
- [65] K. Kang and A. R. White, *Phys. Rev.* **D42**, 835 (1990).
- [66] K. Kang and A. R. White, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A2**, 409 (1987).



## FIGURE CAPTIONS

Fig. 3.1 Evolution of the  $\beta$ -function with  $N_f$  - a)  $N_f \sim 5, 6$ , b)  $N_f \sim 14, 15$ , c)  $N_f = 16$

Fig. 3.2 An infinite series of vacuum diagrams.

Fig. 3.3 Renormalon branch points in the Borel plane.

Fig. 3.4 Movement of renormalons as  $N_f$  increases.

Fig. 5.1 The box-diagram.

Fig. 5.2 Cutting the box-diagram.

Fig. 5.3 Single photon exchange.

Fig. 5.4 N-photon exchange.

Fig. 5.5 The transverse momentum diagram from N-photon exchange.

Fig. 5.6 A sixth-order ladder diagram in  $QED$ .

Fig. 5.7 Additional sixth-order diagrams needed for the transverse momentum cancellation.

Fig. 5.8 Sub-diagrams responsible for softening the transverse momentum loop integration.

Fig. 5.9 Diagrammatic representation of transverse momentum integrals.

Fig. 5.10 Tree diagrams giving the leading high-energy behavior in a spontaneously-broken gauge theory.

Fig. 5.11 Multi-regge kinematics.

Fig. 5.12 Transverse momentum diagrams from the three-particle s-channel states.

Fig. 5.13 s-channel iteration of elastic scattering

Fig. 6.1 The two-reggeon diagram.

Fig. 6.2 The reggeon diagrams contributing up to tenth order.

Fig. 6.3 The propagator and vertex for reggeized gluon RFT.

Fig. 6.4 Insertion of multi-regge amplitudes into the unitarity equation.

Fig. 6.5 The gluon-reggeon scattering amplitude.

Fig. 6.6 Regge pole and two-reggeon cut trajectories.

Fig. 6.7 The three-reggeon vertex.

Fig. 6.8 The simplest hexagraph loop diagram with a multiperipheral cut.

Fig. 6.9 Evaluation of the reggeon loop diagram via a multiperipheral cut.

Fig. 6.10 The “bootstrap” equation satisfied by the reggeised gluon.

Fig. 6.11 The series of diagrams generated by the bootstrap equation.

Fig. 6.12 Hexagraph loop contribution to the triple reggeon vertex.

Fig. 6.13 Transverse momentum bubble renormalising the triple-reggeon vertex.

Fig. 6.14 Hexagraph loops that build up higher thresholds in the triple-reggeon vertex.

Fig. 6.15 Higher order diagrams in the even-signature amplitude involving the three-reggeon vertex.

Fig. 6.16 A single loop diagram.

Fig. 6.17 Evaluation of the first diagram in Fig. 6.15 using Fig. 6.16.

Fig. 7.1 Lattice gauge theory phase diagram.

Fig. 7.2 *QED* untwisted and twisted box-diagrams.

Fig. 8.1 Infra-red divergences of the trajectory function.

Fig. 8.2 Infra-red divergences of the four-reggeon interaction.

Fig. 8.3 The complete four-reggeon kernel.

Fig. 8.4 The vanishing of a general reggeon amplitude at  $\underline{k} = 0$ .

Fig. 8.5 The four-reggeon amplitude.

Fig. 8.6 The four-particle amplitude.

Fig. 8.7 The two-reggeon discontinuity of the four-particle amplitude.

Fig. 8.8 Some higher-order divergences.

Fig. 9.1 Bootstrap equation for the reggeization of quarks.

Fig. 9.2 A quark/gluon Regge cut.

Fig. 9.3 The integral equation for the flavored quark/antiquark channel.

Fig. 9.4 The two quark-reggeon/gluon vertex

Fig. 9.5 The quark/antiquark kernel.

Fig. 9.6 The “tower diagrams” in  $QED$ .

Fig. 9.7 Transverse momentum diagrams from the tower diagrams.

Fig. 9.8 A quark/antiquark reggeon diagram.

Fig. 9.9 A reggeon diagram potentially contributing to Fig. 9.8.

Fig. 9.10 A Feynman diagram contributing to Fig. 9.9.

Fig. 9.11 A non-planar Feynman diagram contributing to Fig. 9.8.

Fig. 9.12 The sum of reggeon diagrams giving  $V_c$ .

Fig. 9.13 The hexagraph corresponding to the one-loop diagram.

Fig. 9.14 The crossed hexagraph necessary to define signed amplitudes.

Fig. 9.15 Elastic scattering diagrams involving  $V_c$ .

Fig. 9.16 Infra-red divergences in the diagrams of Fig. 9.15.

Fig. 9.17 Contribution of a quark-reggeon loop to a general reggeized gluon vertex.

Fig. 9.18 A reggeon diagram potentially containing a gluon scaling infra-red divergence.

Fig. 9.19 Iteration of the scaling infra-red divergence.

Fig. 9.20 The vertex appearing in Fig. 9.19.

Fig. 9.21 Group-theoretic signature for elastic scattering amplitudes.

Fig. 9.22 Signed multi-reggeon couplings.

Fig. 10.1 The anomalous odderon gluon configuration coupling via a quark reggeon diagram.

Fig. 10.2 The triple-regge Toller diagram.

Fig. 10.3 Hexagraphs for the triple-regge Toller diagram.

Fig. 10.4 A hexagraph triple discontinuity.

Fig. 10.5 Further triple discontinuities of the same hexagraph.

Fig. 10.6 A triple discontinuity of Fig. 10.1.

Fig. 10.7 The odderon coupling to the quark loop of Fig. 9.11.

Fig. 10.8 The odderon coupling reggeons propagating in different transverse planes.

Fig. 10.9 The coupling of a massive gluon pair via the triangle.

Fig. 10.10 Emission of the O configuration from a quark reggeon state.

Fig. 11.1 The three-Odderon coupling.

Fig. 11.2 Odderon configurations attached across a general Toller diagram.

Fig. 11.3 The essential discontinuity for a four-particle amplitude.

Fig. 11.4 The divergent O configuration associated with the discontinuity channel of Fig. 11.3.

Fig. 11.5 Triple-regge discontinuities.

Fig. 11.6 Divergent O configurations associated with the discontinuity channels of Fig. 11.5.

Fig. 12.1 The breakdown of the  $SU(3)$  color matrix for gluons into  $SU(2)$  representations.

Fig. 12.2 The  $SU(3)$  gauge couplings ( $f_{ijk}$ ) of the  $SU(2)$  representations.

Fig. 12.3 The “ $d_{ijk}$ ” couplings.

Fig. 12.4 Reggeization when all gluons are massive.

Fig. 12.5 The Pomeron in partially-broken  $QCD$ .

Fig. 13.1 A contribution to the triple-Pomeron vertex.

Fig. 13.2 A vacuum production graph.

Fig. 13.3 The  $SU(N)$  color matrix.

Fig. 13.4 The even-signature Pomeron flux loop.

Fig. 13.5 The double-loop in  $SU(4)$ .

Fig. 13.6 The increasing complexity of transverse flux loops as the center of the gauge group increases.

Fig. 13.7 The relationship of a general crossed loop to the double loop of Fig. 13.5.

Fig. 13.8 The world sheet for scattering of open strings via closed string exchange.

Fig. 13.9 Cutting a closed string.

Fig. 13.10 Cutting a double-loop string.

Fig. 13.11 Unitarity for (a) the simple closed string, (b) for the double loop of  $SU(4)$

Fig. 14.1 Quark mass generation via the sextet quark condensate and a four-fermion interaction.